

IMPLEMENTING, WRITING AND THINKING PALAEOLOGIC  
ARCHAEOLOGY IN SLOVENIA

Boris KAVUR

University of Primorska, Science and Research Centre of Koper, SI-6000 Koper, Garibaldijeva 1

e-mail: boris.kavur@zrs.upr.si

## ABSTRACT

*Slovene Palaeolithic archaeology has all the elements of a successful nationalistic story; it has a clear and uncontested, even heroic beginning, represented by S. Brodar's discovery of the bones in Potočka zijalka. Therewith, or to be exact, with the start of his excavations, began the national scientific research of the Palaeolithic period in Slovenia. The institutional foundations were laid in the first years after World War II, when several pioneers of Slovene archaeology joined forces and established the research infrastructure still in operation today. Archaeology and Palaeolithic archaeology were to become antagonists, since one became affiliated with the humanities and the other with natural sciences. Observing the activities of the first three decades after 1945, we can see that researchers excavated test trenches in many caves and rock shelters in their attempts to discover new Palaeolithic sites, and in many of them they came across finds from later archaeological periods. Unfortunately, subsequent reports of these excavations only dealt with the Palaeolithic finds, a sad fact and probably a reflection of a conceptual divide in archaeology. Since the 1980s the situation changed due to a conceptual transformation reaching its peak with the discovery of the Divje babe I bone artefact, changing the international position of Slovene archaeology.*

**Key words:** Archaeology, Palaeolithic, history of research

## ESEGUIRE, SCRIVERE E PENSARE ARCHEOLOGIA DEL PALEOLITICO IN SLOVENIA

## SINTESI

*L'archeologia slovena del paleolitico racchiude tutti gli elementi di una significativa storia nazionale, che ha un inizio chiaro e inconfutabile quasi eroico, rappresentato dalla scoperta di Srečko Brodar che nella grotta Potočka zijalka trovò le prime ossa. Da quel momento, o più precisamente dall'inizio dei suoi scavi incomincia la ricerca scientifica a livello nazionale del paleolitico in Slovenia. I primi quadri istituzionali sono stati formati subito dopo la fine della seconda guerra mondiale, quando alcuni pionieri dell'archeologia slovena hanno unito le loro forze per creare l'infrastruttura di ricerche, che opera tutt'oggi. L'archeologia e l'archeologia dell'età della pietra si sono ritrovate su sponde opposte, poiché la prima era collegata con le scienze umanistiche, la seconda invece con le scienze naturali. Esaminando le attività dei primi tre decenni dopo l'anno 1945, possiamo notare che gli studiosi, nella speranza di scoprire nuovi ritrovamenti del paleolitico, nei loro sondaggi di scavo in numerose grotte e sporgenze rocciose, portavano alla luce pure ritrovamenti di epoche più recenti. Purtroppo, nelle pubblicazioni posteriori venivano presentati soprattutto i ritrovamenti del paleolitico. Questi fatti biasimevoli erano l'espressione della divergenza concettuale nell'archeologia. Dopo l'anno 1980 però, la situazione si capovolge ed ha come conseguenza una trasformazione sostanziale, che raggiunge il suo apice con il ritrovamento del reperto osseo nella grotta Divje babe I e modifica radicalmente anche il ruolo internazionale dell'archeologia slovena.*

**Parole chiave:** archeologia, paleolitico, storia delle ricerche

## INTRODUCTION...

History has apparently always been written by senior members of the scientific community. These people were active for a long time and had a strong influence on the evolution of the science. In most cases their scientific career started long ago and since sticking to ones own ideas and promoting them is a general human characteristic, their attempts at a history of research had a more or less biographical trait. They were generally nice narratives about what was done, but not analyses of how it was done and why. On the other hand, the younger generation might find the task of writing about the history of research a stimulative incentive to get acquainted with the conceptual past of Slovene archaeology. It is the best way to demonstrate the constant progress of science by placing the research results in its contemporary intellectual environment, enabling us to really understand and asses the creative potential of our forerunners – the people who created and developed the science of archaeology.

Not to follow old and, to-date, somewhat inappropriate approaches to the historiography of science only listing events in a chronological order, we should make an attempt at observing our research topic on three levels – how the research was done, what was written about it and what the researchers thought about the object of their research. It is, of course, impossible to draw a line between the three observed categories mentioned above, since they are more analytical categories of historical reconstruction than a research reality, which was never divided so strictly. But if we trace these categories we will be able to detect a vague line between the individual researchers and their impact on the science as a whole. It might be wrong to imagine these three levels as three strictly hierarchically organised units with clear boundaries – the best comparison that jumps to my mind is that of a planetary system in which the constituent parts are constantly moving, influencing and being influenced by other parts on different levels.

While observing the way in which archaeology was implemented, we are actually focusing our attention on the institutional background of archaeological research. The organisation of institutions and the common aims of researchers employed in them were, on the one hand, strongly influenced by the political dictate at the national level; on the other hand, however, the personal initiatives and aspirations of some influential researchers in these institutions helped shape public opinion, which in return influenced the dictate of cultural policy-makers. By trying to get an insight into these dynamic relations we should indirectly observe the basic characteristics of a broader cultural mindset, which formed the cultural and economic background of research. Although proven wrong many times, we may assume that these processes and backgrounds are of long duration

and transcend the personal influence of individual researchers.

When we observe how archaeology was written about, we are moving into a limited sphere of thought in a rather small and narrow archaeological community of a single nation. This level informs us of the inter-scientific relations between archaeologists of different specialisations. By observing the scientific writings – books, papers and, perhaps most important, commemorative speeches and book reviews – we are actually able to see what archaeologists think other archaeologists know and what they expect from their research. At this level the relations and problems are strongly influenced by editorial policies, on the one hand, and the outwards oriented internal scientific standards within specialist groups, on the other. Therefore, the backgrounds observed on this level are, on a temporal scale, of medium duration – we might even suspect that they are generation specific.

Finally, archaeological thought brings us to the individual researcher. This is quite a vague level. Contrary to most beliefs, I believe, this level is most influenced by the social environment. The individual is constantly exposed to pressures, suggestions and information from his surroundings. Due to all the information pouring in, it is the level where an individual researcher can often very swiftly and unpredictably change one's ideas. These details are sometimes hidden in the emotionally coloured and almost confessional parts of articles, where authors are defending their theories or explaining their mistakes. But the clearest example of these traits can be seen in public discussions and interviews.

Sometimes the situation changes – due to new finds, the introduction of new research fields or the activities of a single influential person. In Slovenia a lot has changed in the last century. The analysis of the history of research, its changes and causes presents a problem which will be dealt with in the future; consequently this article ends with the middle of the 1990s, the last decade of the first century of Palaeolithic research in Slovenia.

## ... AND EXPLICATION

Although several texts on the history of Slovene Archaeology were written in the last century, we can only characterize three of them as serious attempts. In all of them (Ložar, 1941; Slapšak, Novaković, 1996; Novaković, 2002) Palaeolithic Archaeology was only mentioned and none of the texts grasped the parallel dynamic of the evolution of the specific scientific field. The texts are oriented towards the evolution of research in later archaeological periods and since they cover longer time spans it was established that "... the history of Slovene archaeology reveals a pattern of sharp ruptures (both in infrastructure and in concept) concomitant with major political changes" (Novaković, 2002, 323).

In the case of Slovene Palaeolithic Archaeology this might be only partly true. Since it was the youngest major field of archaeological research before the introduction of Medieval Archaeology (in Slovene conceptions), it witnessed only the last big political rupture – World War II and the subsequent establishment of the second Yugoslavia. But at a conceptual level – the evolution of Slovene Palaeolithic thought was independent and cut off from the introduction of new concepts and the dynamics inside the rest of Slovene Archaeology. From the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s on we have witnessed a major change in the conception of Palaeolithic research. In the past its main goal was topographic – to discover new sites and to determine their cultural and chronological position, but in the 90s the focus shifted towards environmental research and even archaeological experimental work. The changes were brought on firstly by the work of I. Turk and his systematic research in Divje babe I and later with Vida Pohar's revision of the excavations in Potočka zijalka. Of course the major conceptual change took place after 1997 with the publication of a pierced long bone from a juvenile cave bear found in Divje babe I (Kavur, 2000), which placed this find into the centre of a global debate on the cognitive and technical abilities of the Neanderthals. Although previously announced by some works by Ivan Turk and his colleagues, the strategies and goals of research changed dramatically – consequently, this article deals with the research prior to the discovery. A single find profoundly changed the structure, position and presence of a marginal branch of science in the media – the evaluation of this event, its proper setting into the global archaeological debates and the evaluation of its consequences remains the task for the future.

### FORMATIVE PERIOD

In his first attempt to present the history of research in the article entitled "Palaeolithic of Slovenia", F. Osole divided the history of research into three periods: the period before World War I, the period between the Wars and the period after World War II (Osole, 1965, 9). Such a divide was based on broader historical circumstances which had only a minor impact on the conceptual and epistemological evolution of this research field. Each of these major ruptures of course did bring subtle changes, influencing archaeological thought with a slight delay.

Speaking about the period before World War II, the area of today's Slovenia should be called to attention that was divided between two political formations. The major part of Slovenia was included in Yugoslavia, while the area of Karst and the Littoral were part of Italy. From this period, only the sites and finds from the central part of Slovenia were included into historical and archaeological analyses. Although some finds were later returned to Slovenia, they never received a proper

treatment. Only one site partly, excavated by Italian archaeologists before the World War II, was included in to the schemes of Slovenian Palaeolithic research and influenced them strongly – Betalov spodmol. But only the part excavated by Srečko Brodar after the war was included, as the material from Anelli's excavations was not yet published. On the other hand, we should be aware that even the finds from the rest of Slovenia remained mostly unpublished until the 1980s.

When speaking of Slovene Palaeolithic archaeology today, we can see that the researches before World War I were mostly done on Slovene ethnic territory in the Trieste Karst, outside of Slovenia (then and now) and did not at all influence the conceptual evolution of Slovene archaeology. And since this research was mostly carried out by untrained excavators from Trieste and Vienna, a lot of the finds are lost today, some are either unpublished or without any contextual data and the fact remains that most of the work was done by researchers, who did not belong to the "Slovene tradition" of Palaeolithic research. The facts given above prevent me from extending the history of research into this period, therefore I wish, in the text below, refer to "Slovenian Archaeology" in terms of institutional frameworks for disciplinary research.

In their analysis of the history of Slovenian archaeology B. Slapšak and P. Novaković summed up the situation in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. They stated that the period between the two World Wars was a time of acute underdevelopment on the institutional level. A fully developed archaeological service, comparable to the network in use before 1912, was not established until after 1945 (Slapšak, Novaković, 1996, 285). This is also the time when Slovene Palaeolithic archaeology was born. It was founded by a non-archaeologist in a time when Prehistoric Archaeology was virtually nonexistent. Perhaps these circumstances are to blame for its exclusion from prehistoric archaeology. S. Brodar established a research policy, which he himself followed and also transferred to his successors, after the scientific field had become institutionalised with his employment at the University of Ljubljana.

The first archaeological site, dating to the Palaeolithic and immediately recognised as such, was the cave of Potočka zijalka, discovered in 1928 by Srečko Brodar, a high-school teacher in Celje. His excavations in subsequent years produced, not only the biggest number of Aurignacian bone points in Central and Eastern Europe, but also offered support to the biglacial theory of J. Bayer. Not only the archaeological finds, but also the geographical setting on a mountain, 1700 meters above sea level and the climatological consequences of its position, launched the site and its discoverer in the centre of European Palaeolithic archaeology (Osole, 1987). Although he was not formally educated as an archaeologist; he became the most important interpreter of

man's earliest prehistory on the territory of the first Yugoslavia. He also wrote an extensive examination of the Palaeolithic in Slovenia which was published abroad in the first volume of *Quartär* (Brodar, 1938).

After the initial discovery and research, he continued his work in cave sites like Špehovka, Mornova zijalka, Jama pod Herkovimi pečmi, Njivice, Kostanjevica near Krka, and Ajdovska jama. Living and working in Celje, he conducted his research mainly in the Eastern and South-Eastern part of today's Slovenia. In 1939 he returned to Ljubljana, where he was employed as a high-school teacher and in the same year finished his doctoral studies at the University of Ljubljana. Afterwards, everything came to a halt – the war broke out.

After 1945 the study of archaeology had to be established anew in Ljubljana. The only institution to persist was the National museum, where Jože Kastelic was appointed director (Kastelic, 1950). This central national institution covered all archaeological periods, with a single exception of the Palaeolithic. At the same time, the study of archaeology at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ljubljana was still combined with that of history. Researchers dealing with archaeological history pointed out that it was in 1947, when Josip Korošec was employed as professor of prehistoric and Slavic archaeology, that the independent study of archaeology truly began (Kastelic, Slapšak, 2000). But already a year before that Josip Klemenc and Srečko Brodar were thinking of establishing a programme entitled Archaeology (Budja, 2004, 3). Unfortunately, the position of Brodar was beginning to shift more and more towards natural history at this time – the first department which was later transformed into an independent faculty. An attempt at a wholesome and humanistic approach to the Palaeolithic failed in the beginning of the 50s, when the proposed study programme Archaeology and Palaeolithic was not confirmed – although a study major in archaeology was established, Anthropology became subject to Biology and the Palaeolithic became part of Geology and Palaeontology (Budja, 2004, 3–4; Novaković, 2004, 13). Conceptually, the Palaeolithic moved away from the humanistic orientation of archaeology. Predrag Novaković in his *History of Archaeology at the University* looked for the causes of the failure of the study programme in the financial demands of the new proposal, but stressed that the major factor was surely the traditional connection between archaeology and other humanities (Novaković, 2004, 48–50).

Taking into consideration the position of Josip Korošec a decade later, when he refused to include the subject Quarternology in the study of Archaeology and defended the unity of Prehistory with the Palaeolithic being only a part of it (Novaković, 2004, 66), we can assume that the political decisions were the result of an individual's struggle for an affirmative leading role in Archaeology.

On 5<sup>th</sup> September 1945 the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts was established in Ljubljana and a month before that the Institute for the Protection and Scientific Study of Cultural Monuments and Natural History Sites. With these two acts the new government laid the foundations of an archaeological infrastructure, which dominated research strategies of the next 50 years. A year after the Academy had been founded, its research plan was adopted. The plan included archaeological excavations and the archaeological topography of Slovenia.

Following their plan, the Academy established the Archaeological Commission in March 1947 and only a month later J. Kastelic presented its research plan for the first five years. One of the points included in the document was also the urge to conduct scientific research "... in the frontier territories, especially in the littoral area, which Slovene science was cut off from for several decades". This statement explains why the earliest overviews of the state of research of the Slovene Palaeolithic included the history of research prior to World War I, conducted in the eastern part of Italy on Slovene ethnic territory (Brodar, 1950; 1955; Osole, 1965). It is true that no conceptual connection to the later Slovene Palaeolithic Archaeology existed, but the political "westbound urge" could not be viewed as the only motive. To evaluate it, we should turn our attention to how it was done. The excavations before 1914 were mostly palaeontological excavations which yielded archaeological finds as by-products. Furthermore, Slovene Palaeolithic archaeology was oriented towards Palaeontology from the beginning, as has been pointed out above. It is therefore easy to link "the Prehistory of Palaeolithic research" with palaeontological excavations, conducted in the western, previously Italian part of Slovenia.

The Founding Act, establishing the Academy of Sciences and Arts, was passed in 1947. Based on this act the Institute of History was founded, which included also the Section for Archaeology. S. Brodar, who was working at the Section for Prehistory of the Institute of Geology, cooperated with the Section for Archaeology in this period. This cooperation was formalised in 1950, when he was included into the scientific council of the Section, next to J. Korošec, J. Kastelic, J. Klemenc and B. Škerlj. There-with, Palaeolithic research was officially included into the framework of the Section for Archaeology.

J. Korošec started the publication of the first Slovenian archaeological journal – *Arheološki vestnik* in 1950 at the Department of Archaeology at the Faculty of Arts. It started completely from scratch, but took place in the same year as the revival of the great archaeological journals such as *Starinar* in Belgrade, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* in Split and *Germania*, as well as *Berichte RGK*, in Germany (Gabrovec, 1979).

S. Brodar was elected professor at the Institute for the Prehistory of Man in 1946, but his chair was part of the Faculty for Mathematics and Natural Sciences (Osole,

1963). He was given the honour of writing the first article in the first volume of *Arheološki vestnik*, entitled "A cut through the Slovene Palaeolithic" (Brodar, 1950). The first major archaeological article on the Slovene Palaeolithic after 1945 was thereby an historical examination of research in this field, whose form and content determined the future fashion of writing about Palaeolithic Archaeology. The article had all the characteristics of most of the later articles written on this theme – it would be illustrative to expose three of them.

In an attempt to demonstrate the historical evolution of this specific scientific field the article lists all the major discoveries of palaeolithic sites in a chronological order. Beside data on the time of discovery, the discoverer, the original interpretation, it also provides a contemporary interpretation of the finds – an interpretation possible at the time of writing. This makes the article, and most other articles written later, no more than a recent reinterpretation of past discoveries and an indication of the period in which it was written.

The second characteristic is the overall discomfort with cultural determinations. Ever since authors described the Slovene palaeolithic finds, they were comparing them with finds from neighbouring regions, accommodating the cultural successions with the dynamics outside of Slovenia and lamenting on the difference between the archaeological record of the French and Slovene Palaeolithic.

Another characteristic of most archaeological articles in the 1950s and 60s is the post war frustration with the western border of Slovenia. When describing the history of research on "Slovene territory" it is the territory on which Slovenians lived in the 50s and not that of the Republic that is taken into consideration. The first act of palaeolithic research is described to have happened in the Trieste Karst, i.e. outside of Slovene territory of that time, and by Italian and Austrian researchers. It is not clear to what degree this orientation is a consequence of a broader political dictate or simply a personal orientation of a scholar who was wounded in World War I at Doberdob on the Italian front. Whatever the reason, the orientation was in accordance with official Slovene politics, a fact that was already echoed in the first programme issued by J. Korošec.

When in 1963 S. Brodar's successor at the Faculty, Franc Osole, described his professor, he characterised him as a person "...with a clear view of natural history and a consistently dialectically materialistic mind..." (Osole, 1963). One should bear in mind that it is not a historic text, but a public speech delivered on the occasion of the 70th birthday of the laureate S. Brodar; yet, this is a significant example of the genre of public speeches given at different anniversaries. Although we cannot learn a lot of history from them, these texts, commemorating anniversaries of researchers, scientific societies, or magazines (Škerlj, 1953; Osole, 1963; Du-

lar, 1986; Pohar, 2000; Gabrovec, 1998), do not offer much historical information, but they do mirror the broader political context of working in Archaeology and employ a dictum that reflected the political situation of that period. As shown above, the philosophy of dialectical materialism, which formed the ideological foundations of post-war socialist societies, were generally never introduced into the real research goals of Prehistoric Archaeology. It remained only a superficial characteristic of the declarative dictum of public presentations, which celebrated the "achievements and victories of the working people".

Evaluating the work of S. Brodar, while taking into consideration the memories of his co-workers and students, the first part of the description, given above, would be the correct one. Although he laid the foundations for Palaeolithic Archaeology without any institutional support on a national level, he very soon realized the importance of cooperating with other scientists. Because of his intellectual background, this cooperation was aimed at scientists working in the fields of natural science – geology, sedimentology, palaeontology, anthracotomy, and palynology. One may see in these ties an approach to concepts of Palaeolithic Archaeology from the first half of the century, when the status of past ages and the correct recognition of palaeontological remains played a prominent role in research. On the other hand, these approaches can generally be identified as characteristic for every scientific beginning, when the basics for research are being laid. S. Brodar, generally characteristic of most archaeologists conducting their research in the Alpine area, where the remains of cave bears in caves are abundant, exceeded the concepts of natural history only involving the debate on the cave bear cult. This was the only social hypothesis allowed in the world of the Ice Age humans, who were thought of only having ecological relations with their prey.

It is interesting that in this period, this was not only the opinion of the people working in palaeolithic research, but also of the other archaeologists. When J. Korošec discussed the tasks of archaeology in 1950 (Korošec, 1950, 7), he included the research of the Palaeolithic in the science of Archaeology in its broader sense, but considered it to be connected more with Geology and Palaeontology, since its main objective was to establish the chronology and the economy with "...the cultural remains, howsoever interesting and important," having "only a secondary meaning".

The major changes following 1945 were, of course, political – the annexation of the former Italian provinces of the Littoral and Istria to Slovenia and Croatia and the introduction of a socialist system. These circumstances influenced Archaeology, as well, which changed completely at the time. The few professional archaeologists active before the war migrated and a new institutional system with new researchers was established. According

to Novaković (2002, 335) the main change was that: "The Archaeology of the 1950s finally "outgrew" it's more than 70 year status as "the science of two or three". But this was not the case with Palaeolithic Archaeology.

### GATHERING INFORMATION

To understand the political dictate on the national science of Archaeology we should return to 1950 and to the first conference of Yugoslav archaeologists in Niška Banja. The conference was planned as a meeting in which a new programme of Archaeology in Yugoslavia was to be proposed. The representatives concluded the meeting with a resolution containing the following points (Korošec, 1951):

Ad 1 "Archaeology should be, as a socio-historical science, directed at the examination of material and intellectual culture on the basis of scientific findings of historical materialism."

Ad 2 "... the focus should be shifted towards the examination of material culture of our nations...", which "will only increase the future solidification of the brotherhood and unity between our nations and will also increase the socialist patriotism".

Among other conclusions, written in a political tone, the plan was also to start intensive and systematic field research to provide material for an archaeological map of Yugoslavia.

J. Korošec resigned as the head of the Archaeological section at the Academy of Arts and Sciences in the beginning of 1959 and his position was taken by S. Brodar. The new head issued a new summary of decisions of the Institute programme: "Its task being to demonstrate the development of society, its economic and social relations on the basis of the remains of material culture." (Pleterski, 1997, 49). The relations mentioned above would of course have to be chronologically determined. Consequently, the search for the optimal chronological course of the Pleistocene, which should be recognised by geological changes produced by the climatic variation, became the second most important goal of palaeolithic research. In the second half of the 1960s it was thought that the broader climatic cycles in the Alpine area were known well enough to be used as a marker for the chronological determination of a particular site (Brodar, 1967). Such a way of thinking was understandable, since Palaeolithic Archaeology was traditionally linked to natural sciences. In the long term, however, this orientation was not to its advantage. Since the belief in the correctness of geological chronology was firmly established, the micro chronology of individual visits to the site was largely ignored and layers that sometimes included more than one level with archaeological remains were merged. Not to mention the problems with the correlation of individual micro sedimentological situations with the regional, globally influenced climatic cycles.

The late 1950s and 60s were characterized by feverish collecting of information. On the one hand, new, politically dictated excavations started in the western part of Slovenia and on the other hand, analyses of finds in Slovene, Austrian, and Italian museum collections were undertaken. Since the analyses of finds in museums abroad were not (and are still not) completed, new syntheses were based mainly on recently discovered finds. S. Brodar visited the excavations conducted by F. Anelli in a cave called Betalov spodmol near the town of Postojna. After 1945 he continued Anelli's excavations there and afterwards extended his search for palaeolithic sites to the whole region. Sites like Risovec, Parska golobina, Jama v Lozi, Županov spodmol, Zakajeni spodmol, and Ovčja jama were partially excavated in the next two decades.

Since the Section for Archaeology lacked its own employees, the major part of the excavations was conducted by external associates, from 1957 mostly by Franc Osole. When the post of the Section's director was taken by S. Brodar, the number of cave excavations increased, while other excavations practically did not take place. The situation changed in the 1970s and after 1975 cave excavations almost ceased. In a recent survey it has been shown that approximately half of all the excavations undertaken by the Institute of Archaeology, and the Section as its predecessor, were conducted in a cave (Belak, 1997).

F. Osole graduated in Biology and Geology at the Natural History Department of the Faculty of Arts in 1952. After teaching Biology for a year, he was employed as a teaching assistant at the Institute for the Prehistory of Man. In 1960 he received his doctor's degree and was elected assistant professor for Quaternary studies and four years later the Palaeolithic of Yugoslavia. In 1969, following the resignation of S. Brodar, he took over all his lectures at the Departments of Geology and Archaeology.

Almost 15 years after *Arheološki vestnik*, another periodical, intended only for publication of prehistoric finds, made its modest appearance. It was named *Poročilo o raziskovanju neolita in eneolita v Sloveniji* (Report on the Research of the Neolithic and Copper Age in Slovenia). Its first number was issued in 1964, with the second following a year after that. Intended only for the publication of finds from the Neolithic and the Copper Age, it soon slipped into oblivion, only to be resurrected again in 1974 and thematically expanded into *Poročilo o raziskovanju paleolita, neolita in eneolita v Sloveniji* (Report on the Research of the Palaeolithic, Neolithic and Copper Age in Slovenia). In spite of its title and the fact that it was published by the Chair for the Archaeology of Pre-metal Periods at the Department of Archaeology, Palaeolithic Archaeology at the Department was still taught by F. Osole from the Department of Geology.

Financially, these were the worst years. Because of

the general crisis in the late 1950s, M. Brodar established the Slovenian branch of the Archaeological Society of Yugoslavia in 1960 and managed to include the task of resuming the archaeological topography of Slovenia in the programme of the new Society. The topography was to include all archaeological periods from the Palaeolithic to the Middle Ages. A five year contract was signed with the Federal Fond for Scientific Work for the execution of the project with the official title "The Archaeological Map of Yugoslavia". S. Brodar was appointed federal coordinator for the realisation of the project and his task was to appoint regional executive committees. In Slovenia the coordination was directed by M. Brodar as president and S. Jesse, S. Pahič, and P. Petru as members of the committee. S. Pahič introduced the methodology to be used for the collection of data (Pahič, 1962). Beside more technical guidelines, Pahič also presented the tasks of the project – the first one was to "...take care of the archived evidence of archaeological sites on Slovene ethnic territory."

Again the notion appeared that the duty of Slovene Archaeology was to conduct research on the whole Slovene ethnic territory – despite the fact that some parts of it were located in neighbouring states. Archaeologists dealing in Prehistory were oriented towards the West, while archaeologists and historians dealing with the Early Middle Ages focused their attention towards the North, to the area of the first Slavic state during the 8th and 9th century. These were actually the two different concepts in existence: in Italy Slovene scientists conducted research on the past of the territory where Slovenians lived at that moment and in Austria Slovene scientists conducted research on the past of the Slovenians which lived there in the past and still lived there at the time when research was being done. We might be allowed to call the first one a "national" archaeology, since it undertook research on the past of the territory and the second one a "nationalistic" archaeology since it conducted research into the past of our direct ancestors. The two archaeologies had some things in common: they were both state funded and Slovene archaeologists never did any fieldwork there. But there was also a difference between the two. Namely, that the archaeological finds of the early Slavic sites in Austria were published in Slovene literature, whereas, in the case of palaeolithic research in the Trieste Karst, only the history of research was published. Although appearing Slovene archaeological literature, the sites and finds from Italian and Austrian sites were not included in the project of the archaeological topography of Slovenia, at least not in the initial period.

It took five years for the project to collect the information and its editing for individual sites took another four years. Overviews for particular periods started to be written in 1969. The publication, however, did not appear until 1975, when M. Brodar ensured additional

funds for the printing. The book *Arheološka najdišča Slovenije* (ANSL, 1975) can be viewed as the greatest achievement of Slovene Archaeology and the high point of the cooperation of the first generation of formally educated Slovene archaeologists.

Not all national archaeological projects were successful. After the 1961 conference on palaeolithic nomenclature in Köln, Germany, although the Institute of Slovenian Language at the Academy of Sciences and Arts was already preparing terminological dictionaries, M. Brodar proposed that each research field should prepare its own terminology. In accordance with this proposal he took charge of the archaeological terminology for the palaeolithic period. After some initial efforts by the Archaeological Section the project came to a halt and the collected material was turned over to the Institute of Slovenian Language.

Oriented even more to the geological field of research, F. Osole co-authored the Slovenian carsological terminology, published in 1973 and contributed to several lexicographical projects. Despite several attempts to revive the project of archaeological terminology, or at least partially revive it, the project was never finished. When Vida Pohar (in cooperation with F. Osole) published her Slovenian translations of French typological lists of stone tools for the Middle and the Upper Palaeolithic (Pohar, 1978; 1979), her terminology was to a degree ignored by the creator of the first attempt at the terminological dictionaries.

### SYNTHESIS OF THE SEVENTIES

In 1972 most scientists of this first generation from the Section for Archaeology retired, leaving room for new generations of archaeologists. S. Brodar retired and in the following months the Section managed to gain greater independence – on 28<sup>th</sup> November 1972 the Section for Archaeology with the Institute of History was transformed into the Institute of Archaeology at the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts. M. Brodar became the first director of the Institute and when the editing of *Arheološka najdišča Slovenije* turned to its final phase in 1972, he concluded in his research program that the newly established Institute should continue with the archaeological topography of Slovenia.

In the beginning of the 1970s the results of the conclusions written 20 years earlier in Niška Banja began to show results and the quantity of archaeological material increased. As the Slovene co-ordinator, M. Brodar took the initiative and was able to secure a certain division rate of national funds intended for research – 10% were designated for the research of the Palaeolithic.

The project of the national archaeological topography of Slovenia was in full swing, when in 1971, at the congress of the UISPP, a short publication entitled *Époque préhistorique et protohistorique en Yougoslavie*

(Novak, 1971) was published. It was intended to show the advanced state of Yugoslav Archaeology to foreign participants of the conference, but as it was being prepared, several contributors expressed the wish to expand the work into a monumental synthesis. The final decision on the constitution of the project was reached at the Conference of Prehistoric Archaeologists in 1972 in Slavonki Brod. The form and the editors of the individual volumes were determined and the main publisher was named. It was suggested that for the elaboration of the volumes, no new field research need be undertaken, but that reports should include previously unpublished finds. The Centre for Balcanological Research of the Academy of Sciences and Arts of Bosnia and Hercegovina edited the project and Đuro Basler was elected editor of the first volume, covering the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic. The initial idea was to present the palaeolithic period on the entire territory of Yugoslavia, but the form was later altered due to some editorial problems and the periods were finally presented for each Republic separately.

The first volume of *Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja. Paleolitsko i mezolitsko doba* (The Prehistory of Yugoslav Countries. Paleolithic and Mesolithic) was published in 1979 (Basler, 1979) and it differed from all subsequent volumes, since later volumes were arranged by periods (volumes for the *Neolithic*, *Copper Age*, *Bronze Age* and *Iron Age*) and the contributions in the volumes were based on individual cultures or cultural groups.

This orientation reflects the approach to the study of Palaeolithic Archaeology not only in Slovenia, but very likely in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well. Fraternising with natural sciences produced not only strong attachments with Geology and Palaeontology, which were means of chronological determination, but also with Geography. The non-humanistic (archaeological) conception of space was therefore reflected on several levels – the geographical area was limited by state borders and the internal division of regions was made according to contemporary standards.

Slovene Archaeology traditionally divided the area of Slovenia in several regions, according to the cultural differences of a particular period. In the Neolithic, for example, the eastern and western parts of Slovenia differ very much, culturally. A division of Slovenia was made also for the Palaeolithic, although the level of research was different. Presented chronological levels were no more than broadened techno-complexes which covered the entire territory of Slovenia in a particular period of time and even extended far beyond it. Notwithstanding, the territory was divided into regions and for each region the known sites were listed. The analytical area was thereby equated with the cultural one and since the analytical area was defined by state borders we have strong reason in calling the Slovene Palaeolithic Archaeology nationalistic. But was this "Nationalist" Ar-

chaeology an outcome of political dictate on Archaeology, or was it rather the result of something else – the general sceptical orientation of Slovene archaeologists.

Perhaps it looks impossible to link geographical conceptions of cultures and conceptual orientations of Archaeology, but they do have something in common – they are both the result of the largest Slovene archaeological project – the publication *Arheološka najdišča Slovenije*. The project was the largest and the longest ever done and it continued even after the volume had been published, since it included all the archaeologists active from the 1950s to the 1970s and strongly influenced their way of thinking, implementing and writing about Archaeology. The main task of their work was to find sites within the borders of Slovenia. Finding sites never posed a problem, writing syntheses on the material discovered, however, did.

A very good example of a synthesis written with a lot of contradictory statements in the first five sentences, is the article "Palaeolithic and Mesolithic regions and cultures in Slovenia", M. Brodar and F. Osole wrote in *Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja* (Brodar, Osole, 1979, 159). The first two sentences read: "The state of research into palaeolithic cultures in Slovene territory cannot, as yet, offer substantial evidence about this oldest and longest prehistoric period to an extent, within which it would be possible to determine particular regions, zones or the like. Any such division would be at this time rash, arbitrary and without a firm base."

But in the fourth and the fifth sentence it is written: "Therefore the palaeolithic cultural remains in Slovenia can only be presented as a whole, organised chronologically, from the oldest periods on, according to cultural stages. That is why the territory of Slovenia is, for practical and didactical reasons, divided into three geographical regions, which, from a culturally-historical perspective, for now do not show any characteristics."

The sceptical orientation is reflected in the constantly repeated phrase "not yet!". Every synthesis in published articles is described as a preliminary listing of new finds, which will produce new facts. According to this conceptual position the time for a proper synthesis is set in the far future, when more facts will be known. This position is clearly a consequence of the ongoing topography of Slovenia. The greatest irony is that the first sentence of the synthesis tells us that the time to produce a synthesis has not yet come and, as a result of this, the spatial division is not possible either, but it is done due to "practical and didactical reasons" – reasons derived from outside of archaeology and significantly influencing it.

The ever ongoing topography is becoming like the quest for the Holy Grail. Archaeologists are constantly looking for it and when they find something they are only sure that that is not it. Popperian philosophy of science never penetrated into Slovene Palaeolithic Archae-



ology and despite the fact that the search for new sites was only partly systematic (it included only test excavations in caves and no open-air surveys), no extensive research system was introduced. Sites were simply functioning as nothing more than dots on two levels. On the chronological level they confirmed the presence of humans in a certain point in time and on the spatial level they confirmed the presence of humans in a certain point in space. The archaeological finds were thought of as, simply, no more than tools for the confirmation of the accuracy of the two points.

### COLLECTING INFORMATION AGAIN

Another indication of the quest for new palaeolithic sites in light of incessant topographical research, was a series of articles by M. Brodar in *Arheološki vestnik*, where he describes test excavations he undertook in caves across Slovenia (Brodar, 1985). Although it was customary to publish preliminary results from excavations in journals, such as *Varstvo spomenikov* and *Arheološki pregled*, he, for the very first time, presented results from excavations, which did not yield any archaeologically positive results at all, in the main archaeological publication in Slovenia.

Another conceptual change occurred at the same time. In 1979 M. Brodar published the article entitled "50 years of Palaeolithic Research in Slovenia". The article is special, in that it marks the shift from the long, towards the short chronology of research. In *Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja* F. Osole included research prior to World War I (Osole, 1979), while in the same year M. Brodar rejected this research and asserted his father's discovery of Potočka zijalka to be the true beginning of palaeolithic research in Slovenia (Brodar, 1979a, 21). This opinion had previously also been shared by F. Osole (Osole, 1967), but in this publication he, contrary to his previous opinions, decided to present the long chronology of research.

It seems that the last years of the 1970s were the turning point in Slovene Palaeolithic Archaeology. The typological lists used as analytical tools for the description of the stone artefacts (Pohar, 1978; 1979a) were published at the same time as the great syntheses of research and cultural sequences (Brodar, 1979; Brodar, Osole, 1979; Osole, 1979). Among the great declarations of pride, however, some minor regrets began to show. M. Brodar wrote an article on 50 successful years of research into the Palaeolithic and concluded it with a complaint that the situation was deteriorating (Brodar, 1979a, 28). He admitted that excavations immediately after 1945 were most rife, with palynologists and palaeontologist cooperating on projects, but that since then the situation did not improve, rather, it even deteriorated. Admitting that at that time no systematic research existed and no one who could continue his work must

have been very painful for a person who co-created the structure of the entire Slovenian archaeology.

To summarise the activities of three decades of work after 1945, we can observe, among other things, a reality, which most probably originating from organisational and financial divisions in Slovene Archaeology. In their attempts to discover new palaeolithic sites, researches excavated test trenches in many caves and rock shelters and in many of them came across finds from later archaeological periods. The reports from these excavations only consider palaeolithic finds, while all the other finds were handed over to specialists for particular periods and, unfortunately, remained unpublished. We should not look for the cause in these differences among research methodologies or excavating techniques, but rather in the paramount need to discover new archaeological sites, a direct consequence of topography. Every specialist was searching for sites from his particular field of interest. The traditional position of Palaeolithic Archaeology in Slovenia proved to be fatal for non-palaeolithic finds, discovered at the initial phases of palaeolithic excavations. Its attachment to natural sciences distanced it from the rest of Archaeology, even at the Institute of Archaeology (M. Brodar) and needles to say at the Department of Geology (F. Osole and later V. Pohar).

### DECONSTRUCTION WITH ELEMENTS OF THE "NEW ARCHAEOLOGY"

Slovene Palaeolithic Archaeology witnessed only one major conceptual change in its development and that one came somewhat late. The change was brought about by a new generation of scientists. In most other major fields of Archaeology it happened a few years earlier, but in palaeolithic research it was connected with the employment and later also research of Ivan Turk at the Institute of Archaeology at the Research Centre of the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts. For several years Ivan Turk excavated for the former director of the Institute, M. Brodar, at the site of Divje babe I and focused on new methods for the scientific processing of geological and palaeontological data. This decision to use new methods proved to be crucial for future research, since it enabled him to deal with large samples of finds. He based his methodology on statistical analysis, whereby his research became theoretically oriented towards "new archaeology" and all this despite the fact that he never fully embraced the nomothetic premises and remained somewhat sceptic towards a higher degree of inclusion of theory into Archaeology.

I. Turk also conducted his own excavations on several sites. He purposely included a large group of scientists working together and publishing their results on the organisational level, for the very first time in the history of palaeolithic research. Beside the usual contributors,

there were also archaeologists specialised in other fields and periods. He continued with the systematic sounding of caves and conducted several excavations in which he, for the very first time, organised a group of co-workers who published the finds from the later archaeological periods as well.

Dealing with large numbers of geological samples taken on a limited area and the results of these excavations pointed out the inappropriateness of old chronological schemes, which were based on a hypothetical course of Alpine glaciations. A new and more appropriate division of the Pleistocene on the Slovenian territory was introduced (Turk, Verbič, 1993). He also drew up a systematic project of dating at the site of Divje babe I, using several different techniques, which, consequently, became one of the best dated sites in Europe. His innovative approaches also led to the discovery of fossilised remains of cave bear hair in the sediments (Turk et al., 1995). In the last 20 years his work proved to be highly innovative, not only on Slovene, but also on an international level, where it triggered one of the biggest and most ardent debates in Palaeolithic Archaeology of this century. Unfortunately, however, the general conception of Palaeolithic Archaeology among other archaeologists still remains as it was.

#### THE LAST DECADE OF THE 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY

The situation in Slovene Palaeolithic Archaeology seems rather strange at present, i. e. in the last 15 years. In this period the only two major systematic, problem oriented research projects, running in Slovenia in the last 15 years, came to an end; excavations both in Divje babe I and in Potočka zijalka were concluded. These are also the only two sites to be published in a monographic form.

The only find, or better yet, problem to attract wider attention was a perforated bone, discovered in the cave Divje Babe I and interpreted as a flute (Turk, Dirjec, Kavur, 1997; Turk, 1997). It might have passed unnoticed if it had not been presented on a broader level and as a central point of multidisciplinary research. On an international level it attracted attention because of its age and its questionability. In Slovenia, however, it exceeded the "normal" framework of palaeolithic research. The leader of the project, I. Turk, included, not only the work of archaeologists, but also that of ethnographers and musicologists that he had cooperated with, in the final publication. Seen from a traditionally Slovene perspective, organizing an international scientific discussion, where opponents and advocates of the "flute theory" were to be present, was unusual. Thereby, Turk did not only overstep the traditional framework of palaeolithic publications, but also widened the debate on a specific subject to a point never experienced before in Slovenia.

Something else happened in Slovene Archaeology at the same time. During the large scale rescue excavations on highway routes, three palaeolithic sites (Podgorica, Zemono II and Kamna Gorica) and several isolated finds of stone artefacts (Pod Kotom – sever, Čatež – Sredno polje, Col, Dragomelj) that most probably date to the Palaeolithic, were discovered. But these were not the only finds discovered recently – at least one new site was discovered by local archaeologists (Cerkniško jezero).

This development introduced several new problems. In the past Palaeolithic Archaeology was conducted exclusively by specialists and was mostly ignored by the rest of the archaeological community. As a consequence of this development the general knowledge about this period, the methodology of Stone Age site excavations and artefact research among most other archaeologists is rather alarming and the prospect of seeing the finds properly published is rather weak.

Having said all of the above, we can conclude that the archaeologists with a poor knowledge of the Palaeolithic are actually victims of the system and the responsibility is to be placed on institutions and individuals dealing in Palaeolithic Archaeology: researchers at the Institute of Archaeology and at the Department of Geology. They have been less successful on two levels – on the one hand they have partly failed to follow the recent changes and trends in the development of European Palaeolithic Archaeology and on the other, they have failed to inform and educate other Slovene archaeologists in what they were doing.

When observing the history of employment policy in Archaeology and archaeological research in Slovenia, we can understand why it was so difficult to introduce people with fresh ideas into different institutions. Strict division of research areas and a partial shift away from archaeology, which was explained as being based on the geological and palaeontological origins of Palaeolithic Archaeology, and the specific methods of field work, all created an isolated subsystem in Slovene archaeology. The isolation was maintained by a very small numbers of people active in the field. The number of people employed to conduct formal research on the Palaeolithic period was constantly the same, from the founding of the institutions in the early 1950s until today. And the trend is nowadays negative. Looking back we can conclude that the Palaeolithic is the most self isolated and conservative, but also innovative research field of Slovene Archaeology.

The orientation and position of Palaeolithic Archaeology was, in spite cooperation with other research fields, mostly ignored by the rest of the Slovene archaeological community – and it in turn ignored the rest of Slovene Archaeology. The consequence of this mutual lack of interest was a late beginning to stone tool studies in younger archaeological periods, and, although

a little earlier, an implementation of modern research trends and cooperation with specialists for younger archaeological periods in Palaeolithic Archaeology. In other words, Palaeolithic Archaeology in Slovenia did not undergo any formal changes in its 50 years of existence. The structure remained the same – it was and it is still implemented by two people, working in two institutions – it never became a research field of more than three people and more than two ideas. The National Museum, housing the bulk of palaeolithic finds in Slovenia and with appropriate specialists covering all archaeological periods, is to this day without a specialist for the Palaeolithic.

One cannot avoid an impression that the employment policy was never aimed at expanding activities, but merely at sustaining the extant framework of research. This, on the other hand, halted innovations and limited any major intrusions of theoretical novelties. The people working in Palaeolithic Archaeology were self-satisfied, but would perhaps be open to criticism, if there were any.

### CONCLUSION

Slovene Palaeolithic archaeology has all the elements of a successful nationalistic story; it has a clear and uncontested, even heroic beginning, represented by S. Brodar's discovery of the bones in Potočka zijalka. Therewith, or to be exact, with the start of his excavations, began the national scientific research of the Palaeolithic period in Slovenia. The institutional foundations were laid in the first years after World War II, when several pioneers of Slovene archaeology joined forces and established the research infrastructure still in operation today. As part of the infrastructure the main national archaeological periodical was founded and, although another one was founded later, *Arheološki vestnik* remained the only archaeological magazine to feature book reviews as well as articles.

Since the 1980s the situation changed due to a conceptual transformation reaching its peak with the discovery of the Divje babe I bone artefact, changing the international position of Slovene archaeology.

Unfortunately, *Poročilo o raziskovanju paleolita, neolita in eneolita v Sloveniji* was transformed in 1998 into *Documenta Praehistorica* – a magazine open to a broad spectrum of contributions firstly became specialised for Neolithic studies, only to later become a publication of the annual Neolithic symposium organised by Mihael Budja at the Department of Archaeology. Although this is now one of the most important international magazines for the field of Neolithic studies, a publication dealing also in pre-neolithic research in Slovenia was lost – an effect that became visible in the next decade, when the only space still open for the publication of Palaeolithic finds remains *Arheološki vestnik*.

It therefore follows that the only discussions likely to incite changes of opinions is centred around *Arheološki vestnik*. Unfortunately, discussions before the Divje babe I controversy were few in numbers. Only one major debate arose, which surpassed the level of standard book reviews. At the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s P. Petru (professor of Roman provincial archaeology) wrote the first part of a book entitled *The History of Slovenia* in which he dealt, among other things, with the prehistoric periods (Petru, 1979). Critical remarks were published by M. Brodar (Brodar, 1979b; 1981), but the later evaluation of these comments and the whole debate around the publication, which pointed out the low culture of public debate and the need for it, also demonstrated the unnecessary degree of personal note in the discussion (Slapšak, 1984, 28). In fact, the authors disagreed over the details of a popular science book published at the same time as the final synthetic publications of the Palaeolithic Archaeology. The author under criticism (Petru), as a non-specialist, simply tried to do his best in summarising the published articles and wrote a readable text. M. Brodar, on the other hand, focused in his criticism on the details and attempted to impose a rigid scientific and partly conservative style of debate.

Other non-research oriented genres liable to new ideas were also book reviews, or judging from the way they were written up to the late 1990s, book presentations. Mostly, of course, interesting books which yielded new facts or approaches were presented and this selection also dictated the style of writing. In the history of *Arheološki vestnik* there was, in my opinion, only one single severe and correct book criticism. M. Brodar (Brodar, 1998) justly presented his comments on the book *Le Paléolithique en ancienne Yougoslavie*, written by Anta Montet-White (Montet-White, 1996). Unfortunately, the text was published in the Slovene only, despite the fact that it should have been presented to an international audience. Although he focused on details and sometimes stuck to conservative ideas, he rightfully concluded the text with this sentence (Brodar, 1998, 400): "Burning books is an uncultured act, but we could not blame anyone for burning the complete number of copies printed."

This brings us back to the concepts of Slovene Palaeolithic research. The principal researcher of the 1990s, I. Turk, introduced major and essential changes, but not being an active teacher, he was never given the opportunity to relay these conceptual changes onto a broader archaeological community, which remains very traditional. By publishing his work the results became available to the scientific community, but the reactions, positive as well as negative, came from abroad. Unfortunately, his position and the contemporary structure of Slovene Archaeology did not allow for a regional ideological reproduction. This traditional orientation of the

scientific community, embedded in the sceptical position of science, forms the background for a non-critical perception of changes in other fields of archaeological research. Its result is also ignorance or, to be more specific, an inability to understand temporal relations between written texts, which in turn, in the absence of relevant analytical histories of the research field, creates an illusion that leads most archaeologists to perceive conclusions, dating from half a century ago, as still valid.

So it still looks as, when dealing with a subject of research which extends over a considerable period of time and changed its appearance (at least a little bit), as is the case with Slovene Palaeolithic Archaeology, it is best to

summarise the general trends that characterised it, that appeared and reappeared at different points in time, as short as possible. So, the Slovene Palaeolithic Archaeology entered the second half of the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century:

- Conceptually and methodologically linked to natural sciences and alienated from the rest of Archaeology and humanistic studies in general.

- Strongly bound to old research concepts which were established in its formative period by the founders of this scientific field.

- Until the end of the last decade a science of two or three people.

## IZVAJATI, PISATI IN MISLITI ARHEOLOGIJU STARE KAMENE DOBE V SLOVENIJI

Boris KAVUR

Univerza na Primorskem, Znanstveno-raziskovalno središče Koper, SI-6000 Koper, Garibaldijeva 1

e-mail: boris.kavur@zrs.upr.si

### POVZETEK

*Kljub skoraj stoletni tradiciji raziskav stare kamene dobe v Sloveniji, se arheologija paleolitika izvaja kot specifično raziskovalno področje, na obrobju zgodovinskega in arheološkega celote, kar je kot kaže posledica strukturne delitve slovenske arheologije v trenutku vzpostavitve osrednjih izobraževalnih in raziskovalnih ustanov. Besedilo predstavlja kronološke okvirje formiranja slovenske arheologije ter izpostavlja specifične tematske usmeritve in spremembe na organizacijski ter tudi na konceptualni ravni, ki so oblikovale pozicijo arheologije stare kamene dobe v okvirih razvoja slovenske arheologije. Pregled kaže, da je kljub nekaterim skupnim organizacijskim in infrastrukturnim okvirjem potekal razvoj arheologije stare kamene dobe drugače kot pri drugih obdobjih slovenske arheologije – dejstvo, ki ga lahko pripišemo vplivu drugačnih raziskovalnih smernic, konceptualnih okvirjev ter drugačni, od mlajših arheoloških obdobji nekoliko neodvisni kronologiji zbiranj in sintetiziranj znanj.*

*Obdobje pred drugo svetovno vojno, ki je bilo označeno kot pred-institucionalno, je oblikoval in zaznamoval s svojim delom Srečko Brodar. Prvi je zastavil sistematične raziskave in se je z rezultati svojega dela povzpел med vodilne poznavalce stare kamene dobe v Evropi. Po drugi svetovni vojni je bila arheologija stare kamene dobe, zaradi organizacijskih in tudi osebnih interesov ključnih osebnosti, dodeljena Naravoslovnemu oddelku, ki je bil kasneje preoblikovan v samostojno fakulteto. Žal je tako ostala ločena od izobraževalnega in posledično konceptualnega razvoja slovenske arheologije, kar je povzročilo močnejšo navezavo na naravoslovne vsebine ter oddaljevanje od humanističnih, predvsem kulturnih konceptov.*

*Skladno s političnimi smernicami je za razliko od predvojnega obdobja bilo težišče raziskav usmerjeno na področje zahodne Slovenije oziroma na področje matičnega Krasa. V času razvoja slovenske arheološke raziskovalne infrastrukture je arheologija stare kamene dobe igrala pomembno vlogo, kar je jasno razvidno tudi iz visokega števila testnih izkopavanj v jamah in spodmolih. Večina mlajših arheoloških najdb iz takratnih izkopavanj še vedno večinoma ni bila ustrezno analizirana, kar pripisujemo negativnim učinkom delitve raziskovalnih interesov med naravoslovno in humanistično usmerjeno arheologijo.*

*V trenutku širitve muzejske in spomeniško-varstvene mreže, ko se je arheologija preoblikovala iz vede peščice, in je poleg raziskovalnih prevzela tudi spomeniško-varstvene funkcije, je ostalo preučevanje stare kamene dobe omejeno na izključno raziskovalno sfero. Ko se je infrastrukturna organizacija arheologije radikalno spremenila in prilagodila razmeram, ki so jih diktirali posamezni politični okvirji in delovne razmere ter raziskovalne možnosti, je paleolitska arheologija vzdrževala obstoječe okvirje ter je posledično postajala vedno bolj obrobna in izolirana. Prav tako kljub intenzivnemu sodelovanju pri zveznih založniških projektih ni prišlo do večje internacionalizacije poznavanja oziroma intenzivnejših sodelovanj – tako v Jugoslaviji kot tudi v širših okvirjih. Odras je tudi zasnova prvega zvezka Praistorije Jugoslovenskih Zemalja, kjer so za razliko od kasnejših zvezkov, ki so organizirani na osnovi kul-*

turne delitve, sinteze vedenj o stari kameni dobi predstavljene na osnovi upravno-politične delitve jugoslovanskih republik in pokrajin.

Veliki projekti sinteze zgodovinskih in topografskih znanj ob koncu sedemdesetih let so vzpodbudili nov raziskovalni zagon za večino slovenske arheologije. Sovpadli pa so z obdobjem upada sondiranja v jamskih objektih. Kljub založniškemu sodelovanju, tako v znanstveni periodiki, kot tudi v produkciji velikih zgodovinskih pregledov, ki so predstavljali tudi sinteze znanja o posameznih obdobjih, se je vse prevečkrat zgodilo, da je paleolitska arheologija ostala strukturno ujeta v koncepte, ki so jih določale smernice razvoja naravoslovnih znanosti, oziroma so jo za humanistično publiko, z negodovanjem ključnih raziskovalcev, pojasnjevali nestrokovnjaki.

Ključne konceptualne spremembe so se začele v osemdesetih, ko so se predvsem v arheologiji stare kamene dobe uveljavili raziskovalni pristopi z elementi nove, procesno usmerjene arheologije, ki je posnemala dobre raziskovalne prakse in pristope iz predvsem angleško govorečega raziskovalnega področja. Spremembe so doživele vrhunec, ko je zaradi odkritja preluknjane kosti jamskega medveda iz najdišča Divje babe I slovenska arheologija stare kamene dobe ponovno prodrla med mednarodno aktualnejša vprašanja. Žal pa niti izjemna publiciteta ter mednarodna aktualnosti nista uspeli premakniti organizacijskih in institucionalnih okvirjev – okvirjev, ki so bili vzpostavljeni z vzpostavitvijo slovenske povojne arheologije.

**Ključne besede:** arheologija, paleolitik, zgodovina raziskav

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANSL (1979):** Arheološka najdišča Slovenije. Ljubljana, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, Inštitut za arheologijo – Državna založba Slovenije.
- Basler, Đ. (ed.) (1979):** Praistorija Jugoslovanskih Zemalja, I. Paleolitsko i mezolitsko doba. Sarajevo, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja.
- Belak, M. (1997):** Izkopavanja, ki jih je (so)financiral inštitut. In: Pleterski, A.: Inštitut za arheologijo polstoletnik. Ljubljana, ZRC SAZU, 98–105.
- Brodar, M. (1979a):** 50 years of Palaeolithic research in Slovenia. Arheološki vestnik, 30. Ljubljana, 21–28.
- Brodar, M. (1979b):** Paleolitik v "Zgodovini Slovencev". Arheološki vestnik, 30. Ljubljana, 528–543.
- Brodar, M. (1981):** Odgovor na ugovor. Arheološki vestnik, 32. Ljubljana, 645–646.
- Brodar, M. (1985):** Iskanje novih paleolitskih postaj v letih 1971–1982. Arheološki vestnik, 36. Ljubljana, 25–38.
- Brodar, M. (1998):** Anta Montet-White: Le Paléolithique en ancienne Yougoslavie. Arheološki vestnik, 49. Ljubljana, 395–400.
- Brodar, M., Osole, F. (1979):** Paleolitske i mezolitske regije i kulture u Sloveniji. In: Basler, Đ. (ed.): Praistorija Jugoslovanskih Zemalja, I. Paleolitsko i mezolitsko doba. Sarajevo, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja. 159–194.
- Brodar, S. (1938):** Das Paläolithikum in Jugoslawien. Quartär, 1. Erlangen, 140–172.
- Brodar, S. (1950):** Prerez paleolitika na slovenskih tleh. Arheološki vestnik, 1. Ljubljana, 5–11.
- Brodar, S. (1955):** Paleolitik na Krasu. In: Hadži, J. (ed.): Prvi Jugoslovanski speleološki kongres. Ljubljana, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, 79–87.
- Brodar, S. (1967):** Razčlenitev pleistocena. Arheološki vestnik, 18. Ljubljana, 227–233.
- Budja, M. (2004):** Arheologija na Univerzi v Ljubljani – palimpsesti osmih desetletij. In: Novakovič, P. et al.: Osemdeset let študija arheologije na Univerzi v Ljubljani. Ljubljana, Oddelek za arheologijo Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani, 1–10.
- Dular, J. (1986):** Ob petišestdesetletnici Mitje Brodarja. Arheološki vestnik, 37. Ljubljana, 13–16.
- Gabrovec, S. (1979):** Thirty years of prehistoric archaeology in Arheološki vestnik. Arheološki vestnik, 30. Ljubljana, 13–20.
- Gabrovec, S. (1998):** 50 Jahre des Instituts für Archäologie. Arheološki vestnik, 49. Ljubljana, 14–16.
- Kavur, B. (2000):** Na napačni strani. Časopis za kritiko znanosti, 200–201. Ljubljana, 19–29.
- Kastelic, J. (1950):** Narodni muzej v Ljubljani in njegovi problemi. Zgodovinski časopis, 4. Ljubljana, 195–207.
- Kastelic, J., Slapšak, B. (2000):** Oddelek za arheologijo. In: Šumi, J. (ed.): Zbornik 1919–1999. Ljubljana, Filozofska fakulteta, 145–150.
- Korošec, J. (1950):** Arheologija in nekatere njene naloge. Zgodovinski časopis, 4. Ljubljana, 5–22.
- Korošec, J. (1951):** Prvo posvetovanje jugoslovanskih arheologov. Arheološki vestnik, 2. Ljubljana, 73–76.
- Lovenjak, M. (2004):** Zgodovina knjižnice Oddelka za arheologijo. In: Novakovič, P. et al.: Osemdeset let študija arheologije na Univerzi v Ljubljani. Ljubljana, Oddelek za arheologijo Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani, 111–136.
- Ložar, R. (1941):** Razvoj in problemi slovenske arheološke vede. Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino, 17. Ljubljana, 107–148.
- Montet-White, A. (1996):** Le Paléolithique en ancienne Yougoslavie. Grenoble, Jérôme Millon.
- Novak, G. (ed.) (1971):** Epoque préhistorique et proto-

historique en Yougoslavie – Recherches et résultats. Beograd, Comité national d'Organisation du VIII<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Sciences Préhistoriques et Proto-historiques.

**Novaković, P. (2002):** Archaeology in five states – A peculiarity or just another story at the crossroads of "Mitteleuropa" and the Balkans: A case study of Slovenian archaeology. In: Biehl, P. F. (ed.): Archäologien Europas. Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien. Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher, Band 3. Münster, Waxmann, 323–352.

**Novaković, P. (2004):** Zgodovina arheologije na Univerzi v Ljubljani. V: Novaković, P. et al.: Osemdeset let študija arheologije na Univerzi v Ljubljani. Ljubljana, Oddelek za arheologijo Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani, 11–110.

**Osole, F. (1963):** Akademik prof. dr. Srečko Brodar, sedemdesetletnik. Arheološki vestnik, 13–14. Ljubljana, 7–11.

**Osole, F. (1965):** Paleolitik Slovenije. Arheološki vestnik, 15–16. Ljubljana, 9–20.

**Osole, F. (1967):** Oris poselitve Slovenije v pleistocenu. Arheološki vestnik, 18. Ljubljana, 241–246.

**Osole, F. (1979):** Rad na istraživanju paleolitskog i mezolitskog doba u Sloveniji. In: Basler, Đ. (ed.): Praistorija Jugoslovenskih Zemalja. I. Paleolitsko i mezolitsko doba. Sarajevo, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, 129–134.

**Osole, F. (1987):** Brodar, Srečko. Enciklopedija Slovenije 1, A-Ca. Ljubljana, Mladinska knjiga, 387–388.

**Pahič, S. (1962):** Arheološka topografija Slovenije. Argo, 1. Ljubljana, 93–120.

**Petru, P. (1979):** Arheološka obdobja. In: Zgodovina Slovencev. Ljubljana, Cankarjeva založba, 17–93.

**PleTERSki, A. (1997):** Inštitut za arheologijo polstoletnik. Ljubljana, ZRC SAZU.

**Pohar, V. (1978):** Tipologija in statistična obdelava mlajšepaleolitskih kamenih orodnih inventarjev. Poročilo o raziskovanju paleolita, neolita in eneolita v Sloveniji, 6. Ljubljana, 7–42.

**Pohar, V. (1979):** Tehnika izdelave in tipologija staro- in srednjepaleolitskega kamenega orodja. Poročilo o raziskovanju paleolita, neolita in eneolita v Sloveniji, 7. Ljubljana, 15–80.

**Pohar, V. (2000):** Franc Osole (1920–2000). Arheološki vestnik, 51. Ljubljana, 257–258.

**Slapšak, B. (1984):** H konceptu kulturnega razvoja v arheoloških poglavjih Zgodovine Slovencev. Arheo, 4. Ljubljana, 28–29.

**Slapšak, B., Novaković, P. (1996):** Is there national archaeology without nationalism? Archaeological traditions in Slovenia. In: Diaz-Andreu, M., Champion, T. (eds.): Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe. London, University Colledge London Press, 256–293.

**Škerlj, B. (1953):** Šestdesetletnica profesorja Srečka Brodarja. Arheološki vestnik, 4. Ljubljana, 349–350.

**Turk, I. (ed.) (1997):** Mousterian "Bone Flute" and the other finds from Divje babe I Cave in Slovenia. Ljubljana, Založba ZRC SAZU.

**Turk, I. et al. (1995):** 45.000 let stare fosilne dlake jamskega medveda iz najdišča Divje babe I v Sloveniji. Arheološki vestnik, 46. Ljubljana, 39–51.

**Turk, I., Dirjec, J., Kavur, B. (1997):** A-t-on trouvé en Slovéie le plus vieil instrument de musique d'Europe?. L'Anthropologie, 101, 1997, 3. Paris, 531–540.

**Turk, I., Verbič, T. (1993):** Uvodna razprava za posodobitev kronologije mlajšega pleistocena v Sloveniji. Arheološki vestnik, 44. Ljubljana, 29–44.