

FORMIRANJE IDENTITETA ELITE U ISTOČNO- JADRANSKOME ZALEĐU NA PRIJELAZU SA 8. U 9. STOLJEĆE — ULOGA KAROLINŠKOG ORUŽJA

FORMATION OF THE IDENTITY OF THE ELITE IN THE EASTERN ADRIATIC HINTERLAND IN THE LATE 8TH CENTURY AND EARLY 9TH — THE ROLE OF CAROLINGIAN WEAPONRY

Goran Bilogrivić
Odsjek za povijest
Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci
Sveučilišna avenija 4
HR – 51000 Rijeka
goran.bilogrivic@uniri.hr

Goran Bilogrivić
Department of History
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Rijeka
Sveučilišna avenija 4
HR – 51000 Rijeka
goran.bilogrivic@uniri.hr

UDK/UDC: 904.623.44(497.5-3 Dalmacija)"653"
Izvorni znanstveni rad / Original scientific paper

Krajem 8. stoljeća na prostoru današnje Hrvatske te Bosne i Hercegovine pojavljuju se prvi predmeti karolinške provenijencije. Njihova se zastupljenost sve više intenzivira u sljedećim desetljećima, a najzastupljeniji su nalazi oružja i ostalih elemenata ratničke opreme koji potječu mahom iz grobova. Pojedina se groblja i grobovi svojim bogatstvom i kontekstom ističu te predstavljaju primjer u pogrebnom obredu koji slijede i drugi lokaliteti. U ovome se radu proučava aktivna uloga koju su ti predmeti imali u pogrebnim obredima, ali i u definiranju društvenih odnosa uopće, u kontekstu borbe za vlast i konstrukcije identiteta lokalne elite u vrijeme formiranja prvih kneževina u dalmatinskome zaleđu i definiranja odnosa s Franačkim Carstvom.¹

Towards the end of the 8th century the first artefacts of Carolingian provenance start to appear in the territories of present-day Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their quantity becomes steadily greater in the following decades, with weapons and other elements of warrior equipment, found mostly in graves, prevailing in number. Certain cemeteries and graves, outstanding in their richness and context, were setting the example for burial rites which were then followed at other sites. In this paper the active role of these objects is considered, the role which they played in burial rites, and also in defining social relations in general, in a context of power struggle and the construction of the identity of the local elite in the time of formation of the first polities in the Dalmatian hinterland and of defining relations with the Frankish Empire.¹

Ključne riječi:

Identitet elite, ranosrednjovjekovna Hrvatska, Dalmacija, Karolinzi, mačevi, ostruge, ranosrednjovjekovni grobovi

Key words:

Identity of the elite, early medieval Croatia, Dalmatia, Carolingians, swords, spurs, early medieval graves

¹ Ovaj je rad temeljito doraden i znatno nadopunjen tekst koji je izvorno, pod naslovom *Karolinški nalazi i formiranje identiteta elite u ranosrednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj / Carolingian Finds and the Formation of Elite Identity in Early Medieval Croatia* bio predan u tisak za zbornik *Hrvatska arheologija i Aachenski mir, 812.-2012. / Croatian Archaeology and the Treaty of Aachen, 812-2012*, Zadar – Zagreb, još 2013. godine, no tek se 2018. naposljetku ispostavilo kako navedeni zbornik ipak neće biti objavljen. Budući da je pod izvornim naslovom rad i citiran, primjerice, u Bilogrivić 2014, 30; 2018b, 339, 342, smatrao sam potrebnim uputiti na spomenutu okolnost.

¹ This paper is a thoroughly revised and substantially expanded text which, under the title *Karolinški nalazi i formiranje identiteta elite u ranosrednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj / Carolingian Finds and the Formation of Elite Identity in Early Medieval Croatia*, was originally held "in press" in the conference proceedings *Hrvatska arheologija i Aachenski mir, 812.-2012. / Croatian Archaeology and the Treaty of Aachen, 812-2012*, Zadar – Zagreb, from 2013 onwards. Only in 2018 did it become official that these proceedings would not be published. Since the paper has already been cited under its original title, e.g. in Bilogrivić 2014, 30; 2018b, 339, 342, I have considered it necessary to stress the said circumstances.

Uvod

Tijekom većeg dijela 9. stoljeća istočnojadransko zaleđe nalazilo se pod prevlašću Franačkoga Carstva. Do takvog je odnosa došlo najvjerojatnije po završetku rata Karla Velikoga protiv Avara, na samome početku 9. stoljeća, a prevlast je trajala do njegove posljednje četvrtine.² Riječ je o razdoblju obilježenom brojnim arheološkim nalazima karolinške provenijencije, čiji najveći dio čine oružje (mačevi i koplja s krilcima) i konjanička oprema (ostruge s garniturama za nošenje na obući), no prisutni su i predmeti liturgijskog karaktera, rijetki primjerci novca, a vrlo su očiti i utjecaji na crkvenu arhitekturu. Svakako, postoje i drugi aspekti u kojima se u ranosrednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj mogu pronaći odrazi Franačkoga Carstva,³ ali ovdje ću se primarno zadržati na nalazima oružja i ratničke opreme.

U domaćoj se medievističkoj literaturi pri njihovu proučavanju govori najčešće u općenitim kategorijama utjecaja i importa. Smatra ih se odrazom franačkog vrhovništva i pokrštavanja, često u kontekstu naoružavanja franačkih saveznika u prethodno opisanim ratovima s kraja 8. i početka 9. stoljeća, a preciznije darovima vladajućem sloju ili pak rezultatom razmjene dobara, odnosno trgovine.⁴ Zdenko Vinski je u svojim najvažnijim radovima o karolinškim mačevima na području današnje Hrvatske te Bosne i Hercegovine predložio i vjerojatni trgovački smjer kojim su mačevi, koplja i ostruge mogli stići ovamo – preko alpskih prijevoja i sjeverne Italije, kroz Istru i Liburniju pa do dalmatinskoga zaleđa.⁵ Tako predloženi kopneni smjer uglavnom nije osporavan iako su prisutna i donekle drugačija mišljenja pojedinih autora koji ističu ulogu što su je bizantski obalni gradovi u Dalmaciji mogli imati u distribuciji franačke robe prema zaleđu. U tom bi slučaju put dolaska robe iz središnjeg područja Franačkoga Carstva do Dalmacije bio najvjerojatnije pomorski, odnosno brodom preko Jadrana.⁶ Zanimljivo je i viđenje Michaela McCormicka, koji ističe vjerojatnu ulogu Venecije u ovome procesu.⁷ Također, često se postavlja i pitanje mogućnosti lokalne izrade barem dijela ovih nalaza, ponajprije jednostavnijih ostruga, bilo od strane hipotetičnih franačkih putujućih kovača ili pak domaćih slavenskih pod njihovim utjecajem.⁸ Pojedini autori ističu i važnu ulogu ovih nalaza upravo u održavanju društvenih odnosa,

Introduction

Throughout most of the 9th century the eastern Adriatic hinterland was under the overlordship of the Frankish Empire. Such interrelation most probably began at the end of Charlemagne's Avar wars, at the very beginning of the 9th century, and lasted into its final quarter.² This period is characterised by numerous archaeological finds of Carolingian provenance, the greatest part of which are weapons (swords and winged spearheads) and equestrian equipment (spurs with elements of straps for attachment to footwear). Objects of liturgical character are also present, coins only sporadically, while the influence on church architecture is very apparent. There are, without a doubt, other aspects in early medieval Croatia in which reflections of the Frankish Empire can be found,³ but here I shall focus primarily on the finds of weapons and warrior equipment.

In domestic medievalist literature they are discussed mostly within the general categories of influence and import. They are considered to be a reflection of Frankish overlordship and Christianisation, often in the context of arming the Frankish allies in the abovementioned wars of the end of the 8th century and the beginning of the 9th, and even more precisely as gifts to the ruling class, or the result of trade and commerce.⁴ In his most significant papers on Carolingian swords from the territories of present-day Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, Zdenko Vinski proposed a probable trade route which could have brought the swords, spears and spurs to this region – over the Alpine mountain passes and northern Italy, through Istria and Liburnia, finally reaching the Dalmatian hinterland.⁵ Such a route has generally not been contradicted, although there are different opinions of some scholars who emphasise a role for the Byzantine coastal towns of Dalmatia which could have been played in the distribution of Frankish goods to the hinterland. In that case the route by which these goods came from the central parts of the Frankish Empire would most probably have been over sea, i.e. by ship across the Adriatic.⁶ The view of Michael McCormick, who stresses the probable role of Venice in this process, is also interesting.⁷ Another often-raised question is that of local production of at least some of these objects, mostly the simpler examples

2 Ančić 2000, 89–93; Majnarić 2015, 517–526; Budak 2018, 119–123, 161–174, 190–194.

3 Usp. Milošević 2000b; Ančić 2005; 2016. Ovdje svakako valja uputiti i na zbornik Dzino, Milošević, Vedriš 2018. Potonji zbornik je, međutim, objavljen nakon što je ovaj tekst već bio završen pa nije bilo moguće uključiti rezultate u njemu prisutnih istraživanja.

4 Npr. Vinski 1985, 64; Jelovina 1986, 10–13; Ančić 2000, 75; Belošević 2007, 17–18, 279–284; 2010, 135; Milošević 2012a, 466–468; 2016a, 258–262; 2016b, 218–219.

5 Vinski 1981, 19; 1985, 64–65.

6 Goldstein 1995, 107; Curta 2010, 270–272. S ovakvim se viđenjem ipak teže složiti. S jedne strane, zato što se radi o razdoblju sukoba između Bizanta i Franaaka, a s druge, jer se kvalitetno i luksuzno oružje, kakvi su brojni ovdašnji primjerci, nije tek tako distribuiralo uobičajenim trgovačkim putevima. Usp. Steuer 1987, 194.

7 McCormick 2001, 733.

8 Vinski 1985, 72–74; Milošević 2006, 301; 2009, 360–361; Sokol 2006, 107; Belošević 2007, 284; 2010, 102. Za drugačije mišljenje usp. Jurčević 2011.

2 Ančić 2000, 89–93; Majnarić 2015, 517–526; Budak 2018, 119–123, 161–174, 190–194.

3 Cf. Milošević 2000b; Ančić 2005; 2016. Dzino, Milošević, Vedriš 2018 must also be pointed to here. However, it came out of press only after the present text had already been finalized, so the inclusion of the results of the studies published therein was no longer possible.

4 E.g. Vinski 1985, 64; Jelovina 1986, 10–13; Ančić 2000, 75; Belošević 2007, 17–18, 279–284; 2010, 135; Milošević 2012a, 466–468; 2016a, 258–262; 2016b, 218–219.

5 Vinski 1981, 19; 1985, 64–65.

6 Goldstein 1995, 107; Curta 2010, 270–272. It is difficult to agree with such a viewpoint, on the one hand because this was a time of conflict between Byzantium and the Franks, while on the other because high-quality and luxurious weaponry, as many of the examples discussed here are, was not simply distributed via the usual trade routes. Cf. Steuer 1987, 194.

7 McCormick 2001, 733.

nadmetanju elite i formiranju novih identiteta.⁹ Ipak, detaljnija i opsežnija arheološka analiza karolinških i drugih grobnih nalaza toga horizonta, s naglaskom na korištenju elemenata materijalne kulture u procesu formiranja elite i s tim povezanog stvaranja i komuniciranja identiteta na području buduće ranosrednjovjekovne Hrvatske, i dalje nedostaje.¹⁰

Ne analizirajući detaljnije navedena predložena rješenja, u ovome ću radu pokušati dati prilog diskusiji upravo iz potonjeg aspekta, odnosno sa strane moguće aktivne uloge koju su ovi predmeti mogli imati u promjenjivim društvenim procesima na ovome području krajem 8. i tijekom prve polovine 9. stoljeća, u vrijeme redefiniranja političkih odnosa i stvaranja prvih kneževina, naposljetku i Hrvatske. Kako materijalna kultura nije samo jednostavni pasivni odraz (nekadašnjeg) društva nego je nastala smisljeno i s namjerom, mnogi su predmeti uz osnovnu utilitarnu imali i važnu simboličku funkciju, u njih su upisana različita značenja. Kao rezultat proizvodnog procesa i društvenog djelovanja, materijalna je kultura i sama strukturirana djelovanjem pa kao objektivizacija društvene prakse djeluje povratno te je aktivno uključena u strukturiranje društvenih procesa.¹¹ Tako su i ovdje promatrani predmeti karolinške provenijencije, mačevi, koplja i ostruge, bili prije svega oružje i dio konjaničke opreme, što im je svakako bila osnovna funkcija, no njihova je uloga ujedno bila i mnogo šira te društveno važnija. Osim o vlastitu podrijetlu i utjecajima, karolinški ratnički nalazi mogu nam reći ponešto i o stvaranju identiteta tadašnje elite, osnovi buduće ranosrednjovjekovne Hrvatske Kneževine.

Materijalna kultura i identitet na karolinškoj periferiji

U suvremenim pisanim izvorima, prije svega franačkim analima, područje na kojemu će se razviti Hrvatska Kneževina najzastupljenije je u vrijeme ustanka donjopanonskoga kneza Ljudevita, u čijem je suzbijanju značajnu ulogu na strani Franačkog Carstva imao Borna, knez prvo Guduskana pa potom Dalmacije i Liburnije.¹² Upravo iz toga vremena potječe zapis važan za temu ovoga rada, iz tzv. *Einhardovih anala* za godinu 821., gdje se kratko spominje smrt kneza Borne: "*Interea Borna, dux Dalmatiae atque Liburniae, defunctus est, et petente populo atque imperatore consentiente nepos illius, nomine Ladasclavus, successor ei constitutus est.*"¹³ Iz ovoga je kratkog zapisa moguće izvući barem dva važna podatka: 1. Ladislav jest naslijedio Bornu, no za dolazak na vlast bila je potrebna odluka „naroda“; 2. tu je odluku morao potvrditi franački car. Odatle proizlazi da je moć lokalne elite,

of spurs, whether by hypothetical Frankish travelling smiths, or by local Slavic ones under their influence.⁸ Certain authors furthermore stress the important role of these finds precisely in the maintenance of social relations, competition among the elite, and the formation of new identities.⁹ Still, a detailed and more comprehensive archaeological analysis of Carolingian and other grave finds of that horizon, with the emphasis on utilisation of elements of material culture in the process of the formation of the elite and the related formation and communication of identity in the territory of the future early medieval Croatia is still lacking.¹⁰

Without a more thorough analysis of these proposed solutions, in this paper I shall attempt to contribute to the discussion from another aspect: the possible active role which these objects could have played in the changing social processes in this region at the end of the 8th century and during the first half of the 9th, i.e. in a time when political relations were redefined and the first polities created, among them finally also the Croatian Dukedom. Since material culture is not just a passive reflection of a (past) society, but is created meaningfully and intently, many objects had an important symbolic function along with the primary utilitarian one: they were inscribed with different meanings. Being a result of the production process and social agency, material culture is itself structured by agency, and as an objectification of social practice it acts retroactively and is actively incorporated in the structuring of social processes.¹¹ Thus the objects of Carolingian provenance considered here – swords, spearheads and spurs – were primarily weapons and elements of equestrian equipment: that was surely their basic function, but their role was also much wider and socially more important. Aside from their origin and influence, Carolingian warrior finds can also tell us something about the formation of the identity of the elite of the time, the very basis of the early medieval Croatian Dukedom.

Material culture and identity on the Carolingian periphery

In contemporary written sources, primarily Frankish annals, the territory in which the Croatian Dukedom will later be formed is best represented in the time of the uprising of Liudewit, Duke of Lower Pannonia. In the suppression of this uprising, an important part on the side of the Frankish Empire was played by Borna, duke firstly of the Guduscani and then of Dalmatia and Liburnia.¹² Precisely from this period comes an entry important for the topic of this paper, from the so-called *Annals of Einhard*

9 Ančić 2005, 10; 2016, 225, 232; Dzino 2010, 150; 2014, 141; Majnarić 2018, 47.

10 Iznimku svakako čini Dzino 2010, no kako sam autor kaže (isto, 151), u navedenom djelu nije bilo prostora za detaljniju specifično arheološku analizu pa su neke od tema, koje će se ovdje nastojati obraditi, tek dotaknute.

11 Shanks, Tilley 1992, 131–134; Jones 1997, 116–119; Hodder, Hutson 2003, 1–12, 157–159; Moreland 2010, 46–48; također Bilogrivić 2016, 81–87.

12 Za pregled dosadašnjih razmatranja o Guduskanima i knezu Bornu v. Gračanin 2012. V. također drugačije zaključke u Budak 2018, 107–109, 166–169; Bilogrivić 2019a.

13 Annales regni Francorum s. a. 821 (1895, 155). Isti događaj spominje se i u *Životu cara Ludovika*, doduše bez navođenja Borninih titula i odluke „naroda“: "*Inter haec Borna vita privato, successorem ei constituit imperator nepotem suum nomine Ladasclao.*" (*Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, gl. 34, 1995, 402).

8 Vinski 1985, 72–74; Milošević 2006, 301; 2009, 360–361; Sokol 2006, 107; Belošević 2007, 284; 2010, 102. For a different view cf. Jurčević 2011.

9 Ančić 2005, 10; 2016, 225, 232; Dzino 2010, 150; 2014, 141; Majnarić 2018, 47.

10 An exception is certainly Dzino 2010, but as the author himself states (*Ibid.*, 151), there was not space in the cited publication for a more detailed, specifically archaeological, analysis. Thus some of the topics that I shall attempt to consider here were only touched upon therein.

11 Shanks, Tilley 1992, 131–134; Jones 1997, 116–119; Hodder, Hutson 2003, 1–12, 157–159; Moreland 2010, 46–48; also Bilogrivić 2016, 81–87.

12 For an overview of various considerations of the Guduscani and Duke Borna see Gračanin 2012. See also different conclusions in Budak 2018, 107–109, 166–169; Bilogrivić 2019a.

s jedne strane, ovisila o Francima, dok ju je, s druge, bilo nužno osigurati i među vlastitim „narodom“. U perifernim i graničnim područjima Carstva, a u takvo je svakako ulazio prostor Dalmacije i Liburnije, važnu su ulogu svakako imali lokalni moćnici.¹⁴ Kao potvrda njihove odanosti tražila se, između ostaloga, i zakletva caru, postupak zabilježen i detaljno opisan na više mjesta u carskim kapitulacijama i drugim izvorima.¹⁵ Usto, društveni su se odnosi među elitama održavali izmjenom darova, luksuznih predmeta koji su služili kao statusni simboli i simboli moći,¹⁶ a darivanje je oružja imalo važnu ulogu i pri zasnivanju vazalskog odnosa.¹⁷ Tako je, primjerice, dobro poznat i u literaturi više puta istaknut kao primjer slučaj danskoga kralja Haralda Klaka, kojeg donosi Ermold Nigellus u tekstu napisanom u čast cara Ludovika Pobožnog. Ermold navodi kako je Ludovik Haraldu darovao konja i oružje kada mu je ovaj postao vazal, a kad je 826. godine Harald i pokršten pod Ludovikovim kumstvom te je položio zakletvu vjernosti, od cara je kao darove primio luksuzno ukrašen pojas za nošenje mača te Ludovikov mač i zlatne ostruge.¹⁸

U svjetlu ovoga događaja Egon Wamers ponudio je tumačenje poznatoga groba pod tumulom na ulazu u Haithabu (Haiðaby/Hedeby), nekoć važan trgovački grad na samom jugu vikinške Danske, a danas lokalitet kod Schleswiga na sjeveru Njemačke. U tome su grobu u grobnoj komori bila pokopana najvjerojatnije trojica muškaraca, svaki s bogatom ratničkom opremom. U komori su se nalazili i drugi prilozi (karolinški stakleni pehar, vjerdica, konjska orma itd.), a uz nju i tri žrtvovana konja u zasebnoj plitkoj jami. Nad komorom je bio postavljen 17 – 20 m dugačak drveni brod, a sve je djelomično bilo prekriveno manjim humkom od pijeska i kamenja.¹⁹ Za temu ovoga rada najzanimljivije priloge predstavljaju tri luksuzna mača, dva tipa K i treći posebnoga tipa 1 prema Petersenovoj klasifikaciji. Nedvojbeno, riječ je o karolinškim mačevima, od kojih je najluksuzniji, tzv. mač Bb, ukrašen motivima kršćanske ikonografije. Ovaj grob odaje mješavinu kontinentalnih i kršćanskih, kao i vikinških značajki, ali u cjelini se može okarakterizirati kao poganski vikinški ukop. Kako je riječ o ukopu pokojnika iz najvišeg vrha tadašnje danske elite, Wamers je ponudio tumačenje kako bi se moglo raditi i o samome Haraldu iako je takva identifikacija, naravno, nedokaziva u potpunosti. Uostalom, kako autor naglašava, tijekom prve polovine 9. stoljeća poznata su brojna poslanstva danske elite franačkome dvoru, međusobni kontakti i darivanja te su mogu-

for the year 821, in which the death of Duke Borna is briefly mentioned: “*Interea Borna, dux Dalmatiae atque Liburniae, defunctus est, et petente populo atque imperatore consentiente nepos illius, nomine Ladasclavus, successor ei constitutus est.*”²³ From this brief entry it is possible to extract at least two important pieces of information: 1. Ladasclavus (Ladislav) did succeed Borna, but the decision of “the people” was needed to attain authority; 2. that decision had to be confirmed by the Frankish Emperor. From this it then follows that the power of the local elite on the one hand depended on the Franks, while on the other it was necessary to secure it also among their own “people”. In peripheral and frontier areas of the Empire, such as was also the Dalmatian and Liburnian territory, an important role was played by local potentates.²⁴ As confirmation of their loyalty, an oath to the emperor was expected, which was an act recorded and described in many places in royal and imperial capitularies and other sources.²⁵ In addition, social relations among and between elites were maintained through gift-giving of prestige goods, which also served as status symbols and symbols of power,²⁶ while gifts of weapons also had an important role in establishing a vassal relationship.²⁷ One good example is the well-known, and in scholarly literature many times emphasised, case of the Danish king Harald Klak, brought up by Ermoldus Nigellus in a text written in honour of the emperor Louis the Pious. Ermoldus writes that Louis gave Harald a horse and weapons when the latter became his vassal. When Harald was then baptized under Louis’s patronage in 826 and gave him an oath of allegiance, he received, among other things as gifts from the Emperor, a luxuriously decorated sword-belt and Louis’s own sword and golden spurs.²⁸

In the light of this event, Egon Wamers proposes an interpretation of the burial mound near the entrance to Haithabu (Haiðaby/Hedeby), once an important trading town at the very southern end of Viking Denmark, today a site near Schleswig at the very north of Germany. Most probably three men had been buried in a chamber in this grave, each with rich warrior equipment. Other grave goods were also found inside the grave chamber (Carolingian glass beaker, bucket, horse-riding gear etc.), and beside it three sacrificed horses in a separate shallow pit. A ship, 17 – 20 m long, was placed over the chamber and everything partially covered by a smaller mound of sand and

14 Heather 1997, osobito 176–178. Tekst koji slijedi do završetka potpoglavlja također je sastavni dio rada Bilogrivić 2018a, 95–99.

15 McKitterick 2008, 266–270.

16 O maču (i pojasu) kao simbolu vlasti i ranga te luksuznom daru v. Le Jan 2000, 286–287; Nelson 2000, 172; Curta 2010, 271; Costambeys, Innes, MacLean 2011, 278–282. Sličnu simboličku funkciju isticanja statusa i moći imale su i ostruge: Wamers 2005, 57–61; Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009, 167.

17 Le Jan 2000, 293–294. O darovima u kontekstu moći i društvenih odnosa u karolinško vrijeme opširnije Curta 2006, v. također Bilogrivić 2009, 148–149.

18 *In honorem Hludowici*, lib. IV:373–384, 607–608 (1884, 68, 75); usp. Wamers 1994, 36–38; 2005, 159–160, 165–166; Le Jan 2000, 292–293.

19 Detaljno o ovome grobu, okolnostima pronalaska i priložima u njemu: Müller-Wille 1976, 10–30. Nešto drugačije tumačenje, s dva pokojnika radije nego tri, donosi Staecker 2005, 4–7.

13 *Annales regni Francorum*, s. a. 821, (1895, 155). The same event is also mentioned in *The Life of Emperor Louis*, admittedly without listing Borna’s titles and the decision of “the people”: “*Inter haec Borna vita privato, successorem ei constituit imperator nepotem suum nomine Ladasclao.*” (*Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, c. 34, 1995, 402).

14 Heather 1997, esp. 176–178. The text that follows, up until the end of this section, is also an integral part of Bilogrivić 2018a, 95–99.

15 McKitterick 2008, 266–270.

16 On swords and belts as symbols of authority and rank, and as luxurious gifts, see Le Jan 2000, 286–287; Nelson 2000, 172; Curta 2010, 271; Costambeys, Innes, MacLean 2011, 278–282. Spurs also had a similar symbolic function of indicating status and power: Wamers 2005, 57–61; Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009, 167.

17 Le Jan 2000, 293–294. *On gifts in the context of power and social relations in the Carolingian period extensively*: Curta 2006. See also Bilogrivić 2009, 148–149.

18 *In honorem Hludowici*, lib. IV:373–384, 607–608 (1884, 68, 75); cf. Wamers 1994, 36–38; 2005, 159–160, 165–166; Le Jan 2000, 292–293.

će identifikacije pokojnika također višestruke. Dapače, ističe da nije ni toliko važno je li ovdje pokopan Harald osobno, koliko je važna mogućnost da je to mogao biti on.²⁰ Naime, u korištenju karolinških mačeva, ostruga, staklenog pehara, dakle, namjernom isticanju luksuznih predmeta karolinške provenijencije, njihovih simbola statusa i moći, zrcale se bliski odnosi dviju elita unatoč stalnim i žestokim ratovanjima u tome razdoblju. Štoviše, upotreba ovih predmeta u pogrebnom kontekstu, a ranije svakako u održavanju regularnih društvenih odnosa, tumači se i kao svojevrsna *imitatio imperii*, odnosno preuzimanje franačkih oblika i uzoraka isticanja moći i vlasti kod različitih „naroda“ na rubnim područjima Carstva. Pri ceremoniji krštenja, nakon Haralda, i njegova je pratnja odjevena „na franački način“ te bi cjelokupnim činom Harald bio svečano uveden u položaj kao franački, odnosno kršćanski kralj Danske, a njegov „narod“ kao novi franački „narod“.²¹ Nasuprot ovakvoj interpretaciji, Jörn Staecker veći naglasak stavlja na druge pripadnike danske elite i tumači nalaze te ukop u kontekstu lokalnih odnosa moći i sukoba Danaca s Francima i Obodritima.²² Kako god bilo, simbolička važnost oružja i cijeloga ukopa je neosporna.

Slučajevi darivanja u franačkim pisanim izvorima spominju se također i u kontekstu različitih poslanstava od strane susjednih Slavena premda s manje detalja. Wamers tako, kao dodatni primjer, navodi Sabor održan u Frankfurtu 822. godine, na kojemu su prisustvovali poslanici različitih Slavena s istočnoga pograničnog područja.²³ I dok su u zapisu franačkih anala samo navedeni dotični slavenski *gentes*, koji su pred cara pristigli s darovima, u 36. poglavlju Astronomova *Života cara Ludovika* opisano je kako je car na istome saboru rješavao slučaj dvojice braće, pretendenta na položaj vođe (*princeps*) Ljutiča (*Wilzi*) nakon smrti njihova oca. Ludovik je, kako piše Astronom, istražio volju „naroda“, koja je bila na strani mlađega brata, pa je njega i odredio za vođu. Zatim je obojicu obilato darivao te ih obvezao zakletvama i otpustio u prijateljskim odnosima.²⁴ Arheološki odraz ovakvih odnosa, makar ne nužno ove konkretne situacije, na slavenskome području uz istočnu granicu Carstva bili bi primjerice bogati grobovi s raskošnim karolinškim pojasnim garniturama, ostrugama i drugim predmetima iz Češke i Moravske, poput onih s lokaliteta Kolín i Stará Kouřim.²⁵

Prema tomu, u sličnom bi se svjetlu možda mogao promatrati i veći dio nalaza karolinške ratničke opreme iz današnje Hrvatske te Bosne i Hercegovine, a svakako luksuzni primjerci mačeva i

stones.²⁹ The grave goods most interesting for the topic of this paper are three luxurious swords: two of type K, and the third of distinctive type 1, according to Petersen's typological scheme. They are all undoubtedly Carolingian swords, the most luxurious of which (Bb) is decorated with motifs of Christian iconography. This grave reveals a mixture of continental and Christian as well as Viking characteristics, but as a whole can be characterised as a Viking pagan burial. As this was surely the burial of a member of the highest level of the Viking Danish elite, Wamers proposes that it could have been Harald Klak himself, although such identification is, of course, ultimately impossible to confirm. After all, as the author himself points out, numerous visits of the Danish elite to the Frankish court, mutual contacts and exchanges of gifts are known to have taken place during the first half of the 9th century, so that possible identifications of the deceased are also multiple. Indeed, he stresses that whether it really was Harald who had been buried here is not nearly so important as the possibility that it might have been him.²⁰ The use of Carolingian swords, spurs, a glass beaker, i.e. the intentional display of luxurious objects of Carolingian provenance, their symbols of status and power, reflects tight relations between the two elites despite the constant and intense warfare of the time. Moreover, the use of these objects in a burial context, as was surely the case previously in maintaining regular social relations, is interpreted as a sort of *imitatio imperii* – the adoption of Frankish forms and patterns of power and authority display among various “peoples” on the imperial periphery. During the christening ceremony, Harald's followers were also dressed “in a Frankish manner” and so, according to Wamers, Harald would have been solemnly invested as a Frankish, i.e. Christian, king of Denmark and his “people” as a new Frankish “people”.²¹ Contrary to this interpretation, Jörn Staecker places more emphasis on other members of the Danish elite and interprets the finds and burial in the context of local power-relations and conflicts of the Danes with the Franks and the Obodrites.²² Still, the symbolic importance of the weapons and the whole burial is not questioned.

Acts of gift-giving are mentioned in Frankish written sources in the context of various legations from the neighbouring Slavs as well, albeit in less detail. Thus, Wamers also refers to the court held at Frankfurt in 822, at which the legates of various Slavic groups from the eastern frontier territories took part.²³ While the record in the *Annales Regni Francorum* only lists the said Slavic *gentes* that approached the emperor with gifts, in chapter 36 of

20 Wamers 1994, 39–42; 2005, 165–168. Vrijedi, stoga, upozoriti i na dataciju mača Bb na temelju stilskih, ali i tehnoloških karakteristika od strane Monike Lennartsson na kraj raspona koji Wamers predlaže za ukop, odnosno oko 850. godine. Usp. Lennartsson 1997–1998, 497.

21 Wamers 1994, 42; 2005, 166–167, 169–170; Pentz 2010, 137. Dapače, oba autora u drugim dvama pokojnicima, koji su bili pokopani u odvojenom dijelu grobne komore, na temelju priloga vide članove pratnje po uzoru na franački dvor – peharnika i maršala.

22 Staecker 2005, 9, 23–24.

23 Wamers 1994, 34.

24 *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, gl. 36, (1995, 412, 414). Zanimljivo je primijetiti da se ovdje spominje isti način postavljanja nasljednika za vladara kao i u Ladislavovu slučaju 821. godine – voljom „naroda“ i potvrdom cara.

25 Wamers 1994, 33–34; 2005, 169–172.

19 For the details of this grave, its discovery, earlier research and finds: Müller-Wille 1976, 10–30. A slightly different interpretation, proposing two burials instead of three, is given in Staecker 2005, 4–7.

20 Wamers 1994, 39–42; 2005, 165–168. It is thus worth noting the dating of the Haithabu Bb sword on the basis of stylistic, and also technological, characteristics by Monika Lennartsson to the end of the time range which Wamers proposes for the burial, i.e. around 850. Cf. Lennartsson 1997–1998, 497.

21 Wamers 1994, 42; 2005, 166–167, 169–170; Pentz 2010, 137. Moreover, on account of the grave goods, both authors see the other two buried persons, in the separated part of the burial chamber, as a cupbearer and marshal.

22 Staecker 2005, 9, 23–24.

23 Wamers 1994, 34.

ostruga.²⁶ I dok su Franci takvim činom dobivali potvrdu odanosti, pripadnici lokalne elite mogli su ovim predmetima demonstrirati povezanost s Franačkim Carstvom, time si osiguravajući poseban status, povlašteni položaj i moć u društvu.²⁷ Upravo se navedeni odnos može smatrati jednim od temelja njihova novonastajućeg identiteta, koji se iskazivao i u pogrebnim ceremonijama tijekom kojih se u grob prilagala karolinška ratnička oprema, čime su nasljednici ili potomci pokojnika kreirali određenu sliku o njemu, ujedno legitimirajući vlastiti položaj u društvu. Takva je situacija uostalom karakteristična za ranosrednjovjekovno razdoblje diljem Europe.²⁸

Potrebno je naglasiti da ovaj novi identitet ne nastaje ni iz čega. Naime, grobni se ritus u posljednjoj četvrtini 8. i tijekom dijela prve trećine 9. stoljeća u osnovi ne mijenja, dio priloga, i sami grobovi, uglavnom su jednaki uobičajenim grobovima druge polovine 8. stoljeća.²⁹ Međutim, u ovakvom novom, dinamičnom političkom kontekstu, uzrokovanom ekspanzijom Franačkoga Carstva na istočnom Jadranu i u njegovu zaleđu, dio lokalnog stanovništva pronalazi priliku za vlastitu korist i, stajući na stranu Franaka, priskrbljuje si sigurni visoki položaj u društvu i politički probitak. Može se pretpostaviti da se radi o ljudima (obiteljima?) koji su i prije dolaska Franaka bili na čelu lokalnih zajednica, uglednicima (*big-men*) na čelu nešto većih skupina, ali ne treba isključiti ni mogućnost da su i neki drugi pojedinci ili skupine iskoristili novonastale prilike za dolazak na vodeće pozicije. Široka rasprostranjenost i prilična uniformnost karolinških nalaza od Vinodola do Neretve, odnosno ukopa pripadnika elite s njima, mogla bi na prvi pogled sugerirati zaključak kako je riječ o jednoj (etničkoj) skupini. Takav bi zaključak ipak, barem za razdoblje kasnog 8. i ranijeg 9. stoljeća, bio pretjerano generalizirajući. Pripadnici lokalnih elita očito su raspolagali sličnim repertoarom predmeta i ukapali se na istovjetan način,³⁰ no vjerojatnijim se

the Astronomer's *Life of Emperor Louis* there is a description of the case of two brothers, claimants to the position of *princeps* of the Wilzi after the death of their father, which the emperor had to solve. Louis, as the Astronomer writes, investigated the will of the "people", which was on the side of the younger brother, and so appointed him as ruler. Then he gave ample gifts to both of the brothers, bound them by oaths and released them in friendly circumstances.²⁴ Archaeological reflections of such relations, although not necessarily of this particular situation, on Slavic territories adjacent to the eastern frontier of the Empire would include, for example, rich graves with luxurious Carolingian belt-sets, spurs and other objects from Bohemia and Moravia, such as those from the sites of Kolín or Stará Kouřim.²⁵

Accordingly, most finds of Carolingian warrior equipment from present-day Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina might possibly be viewed in a similar light, especially the luxurious examples of swords and spurs.²⁶ While such an act gave the Franks a confirmation of loyalty, members of the local elite could have used these objects to demonstrate their ties with the Carolingian Empire, thus securing for themselves special status, a privileged position and power within their society.²⁷ It is precisely this relationship that can be regarded as one of the foundations of their newly emerging identity. That identity was also expressed in burial ceremonies in which Carolingian warrior equipment was placed in the grave, an act by which the heirs and descendants created a certain image of the deceased, also legitimating their own social position. After all, such situations were characteristic of the early medieval period throughout Europe.²⁸

It is necessary to emphasise that this new identity was not created out of nothing. Burial characteristics basically remained unchanged during the last quarter of the 8th century and a part of

26 Još neke okolnosti mogle bi ići u prilog tezi da su luksuzni mačevi i ostruge, poput primjerice onih iz Orlića, Morpolače, Biskupije, Koljana ili Zadvarja bili darovi lokalnoj eliti. Naime, karolinški mačevi s područja istočnjadranskog zaleđa pripadaju svega trima različitim tipovima, od kojih uvjerljivo prevladava Petersenov tip K. Da je riječ o trgovini, ratnom plijenu ili slično, očekivala bi se veća tipološka raznolikost, a svakako i veći udio tipa H, uvjerljivo najbrojnijeg u cijeloj Europi (usp. Bilogrivić 2009, 144–148). Također, velik dio ostruga, tzv. karolinških hrvatskoga tipa, pokazuje izrazite radioničke sličnosti i koncentriran je gotovo isključivo na ovome području pa je utemeljeno pretpostaviti da su navedene ostruge pristigle ovamo u kratkom vremenskom razdoblju i kontroliranim tokovima. Usp. Jurčević 2011.

27 McKitterick 2008, 290–291. Usp. također Wamers 1994, 34. O eliti u karolinškom svijetu i njihovoj reprezentaciji Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009; Costambeys, Innes, MacLean 2011, 271–323.

28 Nelson 2000, 176; Härke 2001, 24–26, 29; Smith 2005, 119–120, 207. Ranosrednjovjekovni grobovi i groblja pokazuju, naravno, znatno kompleksniju sliku povezanu s različitim identitetima, vjerovanjima i konstrukcijama sjećanja te je iskazivanje moći i društvenog statusa samo jedan dio cjelokupne slike. Usp. Schülke 1999, 94–98; Williams 2005; Brather 2010; Härke 2014.

29 Za groblja 8. i prve polovine 9. stoljeća usp. Belošević 2000; Jarak 2002; Petrinec 2009, 112–115, 119–199.

30 Pokazuju se ipak određene razlike među pojedinim grobovima i područjima, o čemu će biti više riječi u daljnjem dijelu teksta. Usp. Klanica 2005, za grobove s velikomoravskog prostora, gdje autor pokazuje postojanje razlika u količini i tipovima priloga u grobovima, kao i u smještaju i tipovima samih ukopa. Na temelju njih definira različite slojeve unutar elite, kao i regionalne razlike u prilaganju mačeva, ostruga, kopalja i drugih predmeta u grobove. Dapače, Klanica pokazuje da u mnogim slučajevima pripadnicima elite treba smatrati pokojnike u grobovima bez priloga, ali radi se o vremenu ukapanja uz crkve, gdje je upravo blizina groba crkvi indikator visokog statusa. Unatoč tomu, i pri interpretaciji ranosrednjovjekovnih grobova iz Hrvatske i susjednih područja valja imati na umu slična pitanja.

24 *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, c. 36, (1995, 412, 414). It is interesting to note that the same manner of appointing a successor as a ruler is mentioned here as in the case of Ladislav from 821: by the will of "the people" and the Emperor's confirmation.

25 Wamers 1994, 33–34; 2005, 169–172.

26 Certain other circumstances might also go in favour of the thesis that luxurious swords and spurs, such as those from Orlić, Morpolača, Biskupija, Koljani or Zadvarje, were gifts to the local elite. Carolingian swords from the eastern Adriatic hinterland belong to only three different types, with Petersen's type K strongly prevailing. If it were a case of trade, war booty etc., one would expect more typological diversity, and certainly also a higher proportion of type H, by far the most numerous throughout Europe (cf. Bilogrivić 2009, 144–148). Furthermore, a large number of the spurs, of the so-called Croatian type Carolingian spurs, show strong workshop similarities and are concentrated here or less exclusively in this area. It can thus be presumed that they arrived here within a short time period and through controlled channels. Cf. Jurčević 2011.

27 McKitterick 2008, 290–291. Cf. also Wamers 1994, 34. On the elite in the Carolingian world and their representation: Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009; Costambeys, Innes, MacLean 2011, 271–323.

28 Nelson 2000, 176; Härke 2001, 24–26, 29; Smith 2005, 119–120, 207. Early medieval graves, of course, show a much more complex image, connected with various identities, beliefs and constructions of memory. The display of power and social status is only a part of the whole picture. Schülke 1999, 94–98; Williams 2005; Brather 2010; Härke 2014.

čini da su u određenim razdobljima prevladavale pojedine skupine, među kojima nam je prva imenom poznata ona Guduskana, dok nakon njih glavnu ulogu preuzimaju Hrvati.

Kao što je ranije spomenuto, važnu ulogu u ovakvim novim i promjenjivim društvenim odnosima imala je i materijalna kultura, odnosno pojedini njezini elementi, što se može pratiti i u grobnom ritusu, koji se nadopunjava novim statusnim simbolima, u ovom slučaju elementima karolinške ratničke opreme.³¹ Dakle, preuzimaju se novi strani predmeti koji u poznatom kontekstu postaju potencijalnim označiteljima identiteta.³² Proces definiranja i razvijanja takvog identiteta elite podudaran je sa stvaranjem i razvojem prvih kneževina na ovome području (tako i Hrvatske) i mijenjao se zajedno s društvenim i političkim promjenama tijekom 9. stoljeća. U grobljima ga se najjasnije može pratiti upravo u već navedenom razdoblju, od kraja 8. pa do druge trećine 9. stoljeća, ali osnovni preduvjet, povezivanje s Francima, počeo se ostvarivati možda već nešto ranije.

Karolinzi i istočnojadransko zaleđe – rani kontakti

Naime, prvi kontakti s Karlovim kraljevstvom mogli su početi i prije njegova osvajanja Istre oko 788. godine, možda već ubrzo nakon pada Langobardskog Kraljevstva 774. godine, kako nam sugeriraju arheološki nalazi.³³ Prije svega, riječ je o dobro poznatim i višekratno obrađivanim predmetima ukrašenima u tzv. stilu Tasilova kaleža – pojasnoj garnituri iz Mogorjela te jezičcu iz Gornjih Vrbljana u Bosni i Hercegovini (T. 1: 1–2). Precizni je kontekst garniture iz Mogorjela, na žalost, nepoznat, osim činjenice da je pronađena unutar okrugle kule utvrđenog kasnoantičkoga kompleksa, dok je jezičac iz Gornjih Vrbljana pronađen zajedno s ranokarolinškom ostrugom (T. 1: 3) u velikoj sobi tamošnjega stambenog objekta u utvrđenju, no riječ je o jedinim nalazima te vrste na lokalitetu.³⁴ Ovi se predmeti uobičajeno datiraju u drugu polovinu 8. stoljeća, uz pretpostavku da su na ovo područje dospjeli tek oko 800. godine, ili nedugo potom, s prvim franačkim misionarima.³⁵ Budući da se proizvodnja predmeta ukrašenih stilom Tasilova kaleža u novije vrijeme datira okvirno od sredine 8. pa sve do prvih desetljeća 9. stoljeća, uz najveću popularnost između 780. i 820.,³⁶ o ovim nalazima bez precizno poznatoga konteksta teško je donijeti definitivni zaključak. Ipak, ne bi trebalo

the first third of the 9th, with most of the grave goods and graves being more or less the same as the graves of the second half of the 8th century.²⁹ However, in the new and dynamic political context caused by Frankish expansion in the eastern Adriatic and its hinterland, part of the local population found a chance for personal profit and, by siding with the Franks, secured for themselves high social position and political gain. It can be presumed that these were the same people (families?) who had been at the head of local communities prior to the Frankish advancement as well, *big-men* leading somewhat larger groups. Still, one should not rule out the possibility of some other individuals or groups taking advantage of new circumstances for attaining leading positions. The wide distribution and a certain uniformity of Carolingian finds from Vinodol to the River Neretva, i.e. of the burials of the members of the elite with them, might suggest, at first sight and according to traditionalistic interpretation, a conclusion that this is only one (ethnic?) group. Such a conclusion would, however, at least for the period of the late 8th and the early 9th centuries, be overly generalising. Members of local elites obviously disposed of a similar repertoire of objects and were buried in a similar manner,³⁰ but it is more probable that at certain periods certain smaller groups prevailed. The first known in this area were the Gudusciani, while only after them did the Croats take the leading role.

As mentioned earlier, an important role in these new and changeable social relations was played also by material culture or some of its elements. This can also be seen in burial ritual, which was supplemented by new status-symbols, in this case elements of Carolingian warrior equipment.³¹ Consequently, new foreign objects were adopted and, in a familiar context, became potential identity markers.³² The process of the definition and development of such identity of the elite is concurrent with the creation and development of the first polities in this area (among them also Croatia) and kept changing, together with social and political changes during the 9th century. In cemeteries it can most clearly be followed precisely during the period in question, from the late 8th century through to the second third of the 9th, but the basic precondition, connection with the Franks, might already have begun to be realised somewhat earlier.

31 Pitanje materijalne kulture i njezine uloge u formiranju i komuniciranju identiteta, kao i održavanju društvenih odnosa na području ranosrednjovjekovne Hrvatske, temeljito je razmotreno u Bilogrivić 2016.

32 V. također Dzino 2010, 150, 152; 2014, 140–141. Značenje određenog predmeta nije fiksno, već proizlazi iz međuodnosa samih predmeta te predmeta i ljudi, a takvi predmeti potom mogu biti korišteni u konstrukciji identiteta unutar postojećih struktura.

33 Slično sugerira Dzino 2010, 148–150, no bez detaljnijeg osvrta na arheološke nalaze. V. također Basić 2017–2018, 165, bilj. 29, u pogledu pisanih izvora.

34 Werner 1960–1961; Bojanovski 1974, 251; Vinski 1977–1978, 143–165; Zečan 1994, 56–72.

35 Vinski 1977–1978, 162–165. Slično i Milošević 2000c, 112–117, s pripisivanjem nalaza iz Gornjih Vrbljana franačkom ratniku, a ne misionaru.

36 Za temeljitu raspravu o nalazima ovoga stila v. Wamers 2013; Robak 2015. U ovim je radovima navedena i brojna ranija literatura. Z. Robak također ističe, pozivajući se na općenite zaključke E. Wamersa, kako dalmatinski i hercegovački nalazi odražavaju pojačanu karolinšku političku i vojnu aktivnost na tome području, odnosno prisutnost njihovih četa u službi zaštite granica (Robak 2015, 314, 325).

29 For cemeteries of the 8th century and the first half of the 9th, cf. Belošević 2000; Jarak 2002; Petrinc 2009, 112–115, 119–199.

30 Some differences between certain graves and areas are noticeable, though, and shall be discussed further below. Cf. Klanica 2005, for graves of the Moravian area. The author demonstrates differences in quantity and types of grave goods, as also in positioning and types of burials. Based on that, various strata within the elite are defined, as are regional differences in placing swords, spurs, spears and other objects in graves. Indeed, Klanica shows that in many cases the deceased in graves with no grave goods should be considered as members of the elite. However, we can see this in a later period of burial around churches, where the proximity of a grave to the church is an indicator of high status. Nonetheless, similar questions should be borne in mind while interpreting early medieval graves in Croatia and neighbouring areas.

31 The question of material culture and its role in identity formation and negotiation, as well as maintenance of social relations in the territory of early medieval Croatia, is thoroughly discussed in Bilogrivić 2016.

32 Cf. also Dzino 2010, 150, 152; 2014, 140–141. The meaning of a certain object is not fixed, but rather comes from the interrelations between the objects themselves, and the objects and people. Such objects can then be used in the construction of identity within existing structures.

isključiti mogućnost njihova dospjeća u istočnojadransko zaleđe još tijekom druge polovine 8. stoljeća. Također, oni pokazuju i da je došlo do ponovnog korištenja kasnoantičkih utvrđenja. I dok je kod Gornjih Vrbljana vjerojatno riječ o kraćoj epizodi, Mogorjelo je doskora preraslo u važno središte Zahumljana, o čemu svjedoče nešto kasniji mač tipa K, koplja s krilcima i karolinške ostruge, kao i brojni drugi kasniji nalazi sa samog lokaliteta, ali i bliže okolice.³⁷

Za užu temu ovoga rada važniji su nalazi iz Morpolače i Orlića, lokaliteta u blizini kasnijih centara Bribira, odnosno Biskupije i Knina. Na prvome lokalitetu, na položaju Škorića / Tubića kuće, u grobu A pronađene su dvije željezne ostruge, mač, slomljeno šilo i strelica, od čega su danas sačuvani samo mač i jedna ostruga (T. 2: 1–2).³⁸ Mač je najbliži varijanti I kombinacijskog tipa 1 prema tipologiji Alfreda Geibiga, čije je težište proizvodnje u drugoj polovini 8. stoljeća, a ostruga relativno fragilne građe, s oblim kopčama na krajevima krakova i narebrenom bazom trna najvjerojatnije je proizvod zadnje trećine 8. stoljeća,³⁹ dok ostali nalazi povezuju ovaj grob s uobičajenim grobovima druge polovine 8. stoljeća na području Hrvatske. Iz orličkih su pak grobova poznata, na žalost, samo dva mača, bez drugih priloga, pojedinačni i slučajni nalazi iz 1920-ih godina.⁴⁰ Primjerak iz groba A, čiji je balčak ukrašen pozlaćenom mjedi s urezanim ornamentima (T. 2: 3), morfološki je srodan navedenom maču iz Morpolače, dok je balčak mača iz groba B u vrlo lošem stanju sačuvanosti, no također pokazuje najviše sličnosti s Geibigovim kombinacijskim tipom 1, varijante I (T. 2: 4).

Položaji na kojima su pronađeni orlički mačevi međusobne su udaljenosti samo stotinjak metara, a od 2010. do 2013. godine su otprilike na sredini prostora između njih provedena arheološka iskopavanja kojima su unutar ostataka temelja antičke arhitekture iz 4. stoljeća, i uz njih, otkrivena tri groba s kosturnim ukopima datiranim u 8. stoljeće. Oni sugeriraju kako se najvjerojatnije radi o jednom te istom većem groblju,⁴¹ kao što je pretpostavljao već i Lujo Marun na temelju kazivanja tamošnjega stanovništva.⁴² U navedenim su grobovima pronađeni jednostavni nalazi (keramičke posude, željezni nož, strelica, šilo, životinjske kosti), karakteristični za horizont grobova s poganskim značajkama pokapanja. U neposrednoj blizini grobova 1 i 2 nalazila se i kompleksna jama u kojoj su pronađeni odgovarajući nalazi – životinjske kosti, cjelovita keramička posuda i fragmenti keramike,

Carolingians and the eastern Adriatic hinterland: early contacts

The first contacts with the kingdom of Charlemagne might have begun before the Frankish conquest of Istria around 788, possibly soon after the fall of the Lombard Kingdom in 774, as is suggested by archaeological finds.³³ First and foremost, the well-known and much-discussed objects decorated in the so-called Tassilo chalice style: the belt set from Mogorjelo and the belt tongue from Gornji Vrbljani, Bosnia and Herzegovina (Pl. 1: 1–2). The exact context of the set from Mogorjelo is unfortunately unknown, except for the fact that it was found inside the round tower of the fortified late antique complex, while the belt tongue from Gornji Vrbljani was found together with an Early Carolingian spur (Pl. 1: 3) in the big room of the residential building inside the fortification, both being the only finds of the sort at the site.³⁴ These artefacts are usually dated to the second half of the 8th century, with the assumption that they arrived here only around the year 800 or not long after, with the first Frankish missionaries.³⁵ Since the production of objects decorated in the Tassilo chalice style has, in recent times, been dated roughly from the middle of the 8th century up to the first decades of the 9th, with the greatest popularity between 780 and 820,³⁶ it is hard to present a definitive conclusion about these finds, which lack a precise context. Still, the possibility of their arrival in the eastern Adriatic hinterland as early as the second half of the 8th century should not be ruled out. Furthermore, they show a reoccupation of late antique fortifications. And while in Gornji Vrbljani it was probably a shorter episode, Mogorjelo soon developed into an important centre of the Zachlumoi/Chulmians, confirmed by the slightly later type-K sword, winged spearheads and Carolingian spurs, as well as numerous other later finds from the site itself, and also from its closer surroundings.³⁷

More important for the narrower topic of this paper are the finds from Morpolača and Orlič, sites in the vicinity of the later centres of Bribir and Knin, respectively. At the first site, at the position of Škorića / Tubića Kuće, two iron spurs, a sword, a broken awl and an arrowhead were found in grave A, of which only the sword and one spur are preserved today (Pl. 2: 1–2).³⁸ The sword is closest to variant I of combination type 1 according to the typology of Alfred Geibig, produced primarily during the second half of the 8th century; the spur, of relatively fragile build with

37 Usp. Burić, 1996, 141–142; Milošević 2000c, 112–117.

38 Marun 1998, 162–164, 192–193; Petrinc 2009, 21–22. Na istome je lokalitetu pronađen i fragment verižnjače, no bez podataka o kontekstu nalaza. Riječ je o iznimno rijetkom nalazu i skupocjenom komadu ratničkog oklopa, no teško je zaključiti je li istovremena s ranokarolinškim nalazima iz grobova. Prilikom istraživanja početkom 20. stoljeća pronađeni su i brojni ostaci željeznih obruča od vjerdica, noževi i drugi nalazi, a u neposrednoj blizini ovoga groba bio je i tzv. grob B, u kojemu su osim keramičke posude i pojasne kopče pronađene i pozlaćene brončane ostruge vrlo slične onima iz Sultanovića kod Bugojna te iz sarkofaga s Crkvine u Biskupiji, tek malo manje masivne od potonjih. Bez sumnje se ovdje nalazilo vrlo važno i bogato groblje, na kojemu su se, između ostalih, pokapali i vodeći ljudi nekog ranog središta iz okolice Bribira.

39 Bilogrivić 2011. U istome su radu obrađeni i mačevi iz Orlića.

40 Marun 1998, 250, 286; Petrinc 2009, 27–28.

41 Petrinc 2014, 129–130.

42 Marun 1998, 286.

33 Similarly suggested in Dzino 2010, 148–150, but without a more detailed review of the archaeological material. See also Basić 2017–2018, 165, n. 29, regarding the written sources.

34 Werner 1960–1961; Bojanovski 1974, 251; Vinski 1977–1978, 143–165; Zečan 1994, 56–72.

35 Vinski 1977–1978, 162–165. Similarly Milošević 2000c, 112–117, only ascribing the finds from Gornji Vrbljani to a Frankish warrior, not a missionary.

36 For a thorough discussion of finds of this style see Wamers 2013; Robak 2015. Numerous earlier relevant literature is also cited therein. Z. Robak likewise points out, based on the general conclusions of E. Wamers, that the Dalmatian and Herzegovinian finds reflect increased Carolingian political and military activity in the area, i.e. the presence of their troops protecting the frontier (Robak 2015, 314, 325).

37 Cf. Burić, 1996, 141–142; Milošević 2000c, 112–117.

38 Marun 1998, 162–164, 192–193; Petrinc 2009, 21–22. A fragment of chainmail was found at the same site, but without information about the context

kresivo, nož, koštani češalj, keramički pršljeni i dr.⁴³ Ovi grobovi i s njima povezane jame pružaju vrijedne nove podatke za proučavanje pogrebnih običaja unutar spomenutog horizonta i upućuju na kontinuitet pokapanja na ovome lokalitetu tijekom dužeg razdoblja u 8. stoljeću. Osnovana pretpostavka da su dio istoga groblja kao i grobovi u kojima su se nalazili ranokarolinški mačevi, kao i činjenica da je mač iz groba A luksuzni primjerak, mogli bi upućivati na stvaranje prvoga ranosrednjovjekovnog središta na Kosovu polju, no više podataka će pružiti tek daljnja arheološka istraživanja.

Istom ranokarolinškom horizontu pripadaju još poneki nalazi, poput brončane ostruge s reljefno ukrašenim ušicama na krajevima krakova iz korita rijeke Cetine na prijelazu Mali Drinić uzvodno od Trilja, ili pak one iz Gradca kod Posušja, od koje je sačuvan samo luk.⁴⁴ Istovremeno je svakako i dio kopalja s krilcima s hrvatskih i bosanskohercegovačkih nalazišta.⁴⁵ Sve u svemu, gledajući ove najranije karolinške nalaze u cjelini, zbog mahom nepoznatog ili nepotpunog konteksta nalaza, teško je sa sigurnošću donositi čvrste zaključke. No na temelju tipološke klasifikacije nalaza može ih se smjestiti u drugu polovinu 8. stoljeća, odnosno prije 800. godine. Važna je i činjenica da je u Mopoljači pronađen mač iz druge polovine 8. stoljeća zajedno s ostrugom iste datacije, dok se u svim drugim grobovima s mačevima i ostrugama iz Hrvatske te Bosne i Hercegovine nalaze redovito tzv. karolinške ostruge hrvatskoga tipa u kombinaciji s također nešto kasnijim mačevima tipa K.⁴⁶ Stoga, moguće je barem neke od ovdje prikazanih nalaza relativnokronološki datirati prije većine ostalih karolinških nalaza s područja današnje Hrvatske te Bosne i Hercegovine. Također, pojedinačni nalazi predmeta, ukrašenih u stilu Tasilova kaleža, samo naznačuju prve kontakte dalmatinskog i franačkog područja, koji god bio kontekst njihova dolaska u ove krajeve. Nalazi iz Mopoljače i Orlića pak ukazuju na promjene koje će opsežnije uslijediti na samom kraju 8. i tijekom prvih desetljeća 9. stoljeća.

Biskupija-Crkvina

U tom se razdoblju priljev karolinških mačeva i ostruga znatno povećava, a uz njih dolaze i drugi nalazi karolinške provenijencije. Najveći je broj pronađen na Crkvini u Biskupiji, zatim u Gor-

oval buckles at the ends of the branches and a ribbed base of the thorn, is most probably a product of the last third of the 8th century,³⁹ while other finds connect this grave to the usual graves of the second half of the 8th century in Croatia. From the Orlić graves, unfortunately, only swords, individual stray finds from the 1920s, are known, without other grave goods.⁴⁰ The one from grave A with a gilt brass-plated hilt with incised ornamentation (Pl. 2: 3) is morphologically alike to the above-mentioned sword from Mopoljača, while the hilt of the sword from grave B is in a very bad state of preservation but also shows similarities with Geibig's combination type 1, variant I (Pl. 2: 4).

The positions at which the Orlić swords were found are only around 100 m apart, and from 2010 until 2013 archaeological excavations were carried out approximately in the middle of the space between them, revealing three 8th-century inhumation graves within the remains of Roman-period architecture of the 4th century. These suggest the probable existence of one single larger cemetery,⁴¹ as was already presumed by Lujo Marun based on the statements of local inhabitants.⁴² Simpler finds come from those graves (clay pots, iron knife, arrowhead, awl, animal bones), characteristic of the horizon with pagan burial characteristics. In the immediate vicinity of graves 1 and 2 there was a complex pit, also with finds in accord: animal bones, a whole clay pot and further fragments, flint steel, knife, antler comb, clay loom weights, etc.⁴³ These graves and the associated pits give valuable new data for studying burial rites within the said horizon and point to a continuity of burial at this site through a lengthy period in the 8th century. The reasonable presumption that they are part of the same cemetery as the graves with Early Carolingian swords, as well as the fact that the sword from grave A is a luxurious example, might imply the formation of the first early medieval centre in Kosovo Polje, but only further archaeological excavations can provide more information.

Some other finds of spurs belong to the same Early Carolingian horizon, such as the bronze one with relief decoration on its loops from the Cetina river bed at the Mali Drinić ford upriver from Trilj, or the example from Gradac, near Posušje, of which only the branches are preserved.⁴⁴ Some of the winged spearheads from Croatian sites, and those from Bosnia and Herzegovina, are

43 Petrinc 2014, 88–94 i dalje.

44 Zekan 1994, 61, 66; Milošević 2006; Petrinc 2009, 168–169.

45 Usp. Demo 2010. Prema istom autoru, dio kopalja mogao bi biti još stariji, bliži sredini 8. stoljeća, što svakako valja imati na umu kada se govori o mogućim ranim kontaktima dalmatinskog zaleđa s Franačkim Kraljevstvom. Vrijeme ukopa kopalja pronađenih u grobovima, zajedno s mačevima Petersenova tipa K ili H (Zadvarje, Rudići, Stolac-Čairi), ne može se, doduše, pomicati puno prije kraja 8. stoljeća. Dapače, ovi grobovi u cjelini prije upućuju na početak 9. stoljeća, no to nipošto ne isključuje mogućnost ranije proizvodnje i dužeg perioda upotrebe kopalja.

46 U Ninu je riječ o maču bliskom tipu H, no taj je tip također nešto mlađi od mačeva iz Mopoljače i Orlića.

of the find. It is an extremely rare find and a costly element of warrior armour, but it is difficult to conclude whether it is contemporary with the Carolingian grave finds. During excavations in the early 20th century, numerous knives and remains of iron hoops from buckets, as well as other artefacts, were found. In the immediate vicinity of this grave there was also grave B, with finds of a clay pot and a belt buckle, as well as gilt bronze spurs very similar to those from Sultanovići, near Bugojno, and from the sarcophagus at Crkvina in Biskupija, only a little less robust than the latter ones. This was, without a doubt, a very important and rich cemetery where, among others, the leading people of an early centre from the surroundings of Bribir were buried.

39 Bilogrivić 2011. The swords from Orlić are discussed in the same article.

40 Marun 1998, 250, 286; Petrinc 2009, 27–28.

41 Petrinc 2014, 129–130.

42 Marun 1998, 286.

43 Petrinc 2014, 88–94ff.

44 Zekan 1994, 61, 66; Milošević 2006; Petrinc 2009, 168–169.

njim Koljanima, Ninu i u manjem broju na mnogim drugim lokalitetima u Hrvatskoj te Bosni i Hercegovini. Lokaliteti s velikim brojem nalaza karolinške provenijencije i bogatim grobovima obično nazivanim grobovima odličnika, a na kojima će tijekom 9. stoljeća biti podignute važne i bogato opremljene crkve, mogu se s pravom smatrati središnjim mjestima nastajuće kneževine.⁴⁷ Međutim, glavno mjesto među njima pripada svakako Biskupiji, gdje se na temelju grobova s Crkvine mogu detaljnije pratiti glavni smjerovi razvoja identiteta elite.

Bogati grobovi s priložima karolinške ratničke opreme, istraženi oko i unutar temeljnih ostataka predromaničke crkve sv. Marije na Crkvini u Biskupiji kod Knina, temeljito su obrađeni u arheološkoj literaturi pa ih nije potrebno pojedinačno opisivati.⁴⁸ Oni su se, kao i cijeli horizont srodnih nalaza (ranokarolinški mačevi, ostruge, koplja s krilcima), koji se prema njima često naziva *horizontom Biskupija-Crkvina*, različito datirali, od zadnje trećine 8. pa sve do druge polovine 9. stoljeća.⁴⁹ Potrebno je naglasiti da se takva datacija odnosi na čitav horizont, čiji dio su i netom opisani nalazi iz Orlića, Morpolače i drugih lokaliteta, no oni pripadaju njegovoj najranijoj fazi, dok su grobovi iz Biskupije ipak nešto mlađi.⁵⁰ Najvjerojatnijom se, stoga, čini njegova datacija u zadnju trećinu 8. i prvu trećinu 9. stoljeća. Naime, već su Ulrike Giesler i Krzysztof Wachowski u citiranim radovima prilično uvjerljivo pokazali kako se dio nalaza ovoga horizonta može datirati svakako prije 800. godine, i to ne samo s obzirom na razdoblje proizvodnje predmeta nego i s obzirom na razdoblje upotrebe. Wachowski je također pokazao kako datacije u prvu polovinu 9. stoljeća, odnosno isključivo nakon 800. godine, počivaju dobrim dijelom na povijesnim podacima, odnosno pretpostavci da karolinški nalazi nisu mogli dospjeti na područje ranosrednjovjekovne Hrvatske prije izravne franačke ekspanzije na istočnom Jadranu od početka 9. stoljeća.⁵¹

S druge strane, ne mogu se ni svi nalazi ovoga horizonta datirati prije 800. godine, odnosno neki su grobovi s takvim nalazima svakako kasniji, što pokazuju i sami biskupijski grobovi, među kojima postoje određene kronološke razlike. Na njih ukazuju, kako sami predmeti u njima tako i pojedini grobovi u cjelini te njihov prostorni odnos prema crkvenoj arhitekturi.⁵² Prema tomu, mogu se izdvojiti tri, uvjetno rečeno, faze pokapanja unutar tri do četiri desetljeća, gdje bi najraniji svakako bili grobovi u zemljanim rakama 1, 2, 4, 6 i 8, u kojima se nalaze mačevi, ostruge s pticolikim jezičcima, (bojni) noževi, vjedrice i drugi prilozi koji

certainly contemporary.⁴⁵ Looking at these earliest Carolingian finds as a whole it is difficult to draw firm conclusions, due to largely unknown or incomplete contexts. Still, on the basis of their typological classification, they can be dated to the second half of the 8th century, i.e. before 800. Another important fact is that, in Morpolača, a sword of the second half of the 8th century was found together with a spur of the same date, while in all other graves with swords and spurs in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina the so-called Carolingian spurs of Croatian type are regularly found, mostly with swords of the slightly younger type K.⁴⁶ It is thus possible to date at least some of the finds presented above before the majority of other Carolingian finds from present-day Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina in terms of relative chronology. Furthermore, the individual finds decorated in the Tassilo chalice style only signal the first contacts between the Dalmatian and Frankish areas, whatever the context of their arrival in these parts might have been. The finds from Morpolača and Orlić, on the other hand, point to the changes that would, to a larger extent, ensue at the very end of the 8th century and during the first decades of the 9th.

Biskupija-Crkvina

In that period the inflow of Carolingian swords and spurs increased significantly, and with them also came other finds of Carolingian provenance. The largest number was found at Crkvina in Biskupija, then in Gornji Koljani, in Nin and in smaller numbers at various other sites in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Sites with a large number of finds of Carolingian provenance and rich graves, usually termed dignitaries' graves, at which important and richly furnished churches would be built during the 9th century, can rightfully be considered central places of the emerging dukedom.⁴⁷ The main place among them, though, certainly belonged to Biskupija, where the main directions of the development of the elite's identity can be followed on the basis of the graves at Crkvina.

Rich graves with elements of Carolingian warrior equipment discovered around and inside the remains of the pre-Romanesque church of St. Mary at Crkvina in Biskupija, near Knin, have been thoroughly discussed in the archaeological literature, so there is no need to describe them here individually.⁴⁸ They, as well as the entire horizon of similar finds named *Biskupija-Crkvina* after them, have been variously dated, from the last third of the 8th

47 Petrinc 2010b, 57.

48 Usp. Milošević 2000a, 209–228, IV. 39–IV. 55; Petrinc 2009, 66–70, i tamo navedenu stariju literaturu.

49 Posljednja trećina 8. stoljeća: Giesler 1974, 528–532; Wachowski 1983, 163–167. Posljednja trećina 8. i prva trećina 9. stoljeća: Schulze-Dörrlam 1993, 564–565, 568; Petrinc 2006, 26; Robak 2015, 312, bilj. 3 (Robak doduše sužuje dataciju na period oko 790.–820/830.). Prva polovina 9. stoljeća: Werner 1978–1979, 227–237; Menghin 1980, 254; Kleemann 2002, 289–291; Belošević 2007, 276, 282–284. Kleemann datira trajanje horizonta i nakon sredine 9. stoljeća.

50 Usp. Bilogrivić 2011, 87–88.

51 Wachowski 1983.

52 Za odnos grobova i arhitekture usp. Petrinc 2006, 21; Jurčević 2011, 130–133.

45 Cf. Demo 2010. According to the same author, some of the spearheads might be even older, closer to the middle of the 8th century, which has to be borne in mind when speaking of possible early contacts of the Dalmatian hinterland with the Frankish Kingdom. The date of interment of the spearheads found in graves together with swords of Petersen's types K or H (Zadvarje, Rudići, Stolac-Čairi) can not, admittedly, be moved much before the end of the 8th century. Indeed, these graves in their entirety rather suggest an early 9th-century date, but that does not exclude the possibility of earlier production and a longer period of use of the spearheads.

46 From Nin there is a sword close to type H, but that type is likewise somewhat younger than the swords from Morpolača and Orlić.

47 Petrinc 2010b, 57.

48 Cf. Milošević 2000a, 209–228, IV. 39 – IV. 55; Petrinc 2009, 66–70, and the older literature cited therein.

pokazuju tipična obilježja horizonta s poganskim značajkama pokapanja (T. 3: 1).⁵³ Nešto kasniji su grobovi 7, 88 i možda grob 3 (T. 3: 2), u kojima su ostruge uz eventualno solid Konstantina V. Kopronima u funkciji obola zapravo jedini prilozi. Njima se mogu pridružiti i zidane presvođene grobnice koje pripadaju općenito istome sloju i groblju kao i grobovi u zemljanim rakama te također prethode gradnji crkve.⁵⁴ Posljednji je svakako ukop u sarkofagu s hipokampima u sjevernoj prostoriji prizemlja *westwerka* (T. 3: 3; 4: 1),⁵⁵ vjerojatno s kraja prve, najkasnije samog početka druge trećine 9. stoljeća.⁵⁶

Kad se govori o grobovima s karolinškim mačevima i ostrugama s Crkvine u Biskupiji i njihovim međusobnim razlikama, treba imati na umu razliku između vremena nastanka, odnosno proizvodnje ovih predmeta i vremena njihova polaganja u grob. Tipološke i stilske analize predmeta određuju prije svega vrijeme njihove proizvodnje i najfrekventnije upotrebe, dok je za dataci-

century all the way to the second half of the 9th.⁴⁹ It is necessary to stress that such a dating pertains to the entire horizon, part of which is also the finds discussed above from Orlič, Mropolča and other sites, but they belong to its earliest phase, while the graves of Biskupija are somewhat later.⁵⁰ The dating that thus seems to be the best-founded is to the last third of the 8th century and the first third of the 9th. Ulrike Giesler and Krzysztof Wachowski, in their cited papers, have already very convincingly shown that some of the finds of this horizon can undoubtedly be dated before 800, and in the sense not only of their production, but also of their use. Wachowski has also shown that datings to the first half of the 9th century, i.e. exclusively after 800, rely heavily on historical data, i.e. the notion that Carolingian finds could not have arrived in the territory of early medieval Croatia before direct Frankish expansion on the eastern Adriatic from the beginning of the 9th century.⁵¹

On the other hand, not all finds of this horizon can be dated before 800, either. Some graves with such finds are definitely later, as shown by the graves in Biskupija themselves, among which there are certain chronological differences. These are indicated by the very objects inside them, as well as certain graves in their entirety and their spatial relation to the church architecture.⁵² Accordingly, three tentative phases of burial within three to four decades can be isolated, where the earliest would be coffin burials in the plain earthen graves 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8, containing swords, spurs with bird-like strap tongues, (combat) knives, buckets and other goods showing typical features of the horizon with pagan burial characteristics (Pl. 3: 1).⁵³ Slightly later are graves 7, 88 and possibly grave 3 (Pl. 3: 2), in which spurs are in fact the only goods, sometimes complemented with a solidus of Constantine V Copronymus serving as an obolus. Vaulted tombs belonging to the same stratum and cemetery as the plain earthen graves, and also preceding the construction of the church, can be associated with them.⁵⁴ Last is certainly the burial in a sarcophagus decorated with hippocampi in the northern chamber of the ground

53 Za slijed ukopavanja na Crkvinu u Biskupiji usp. i Jurčević 2009, 67–68.

54 Petrinc 2005, 188; 2009, 171. Važno je naglasiti da ove grobnice nisu prepotrebne kasnoantičke (iako su mogle biti građene po uzoru na njih), nego nastaju u ranom srednjem vijeku, upravo za pokojnike koji su pronađeni u njima. Tako služe kao dodatni pokazatelj statusa uz već bogate priloge u njima. Isto se odnosi i na srodne grobnice na Popovića Dolovima u Biskupiji, Crkvinu u Gornjim Koljanima, Greblju u Ostrovici. Usp. također Jurčević 2011, 133; Kleemann 2010, 83, bilj. 28. Za drugačije mišljenje v. Milošević 2000c, 119, 123, gdje se pretpostavlja i kako je na Crkvinu u Biskupiji postojalo manje ranokršćansko groblje vezano uz obližnju crkvu na Katića Bajamima. Konkretni nalazi koji bi na takav zaključak upućivali, međutim, nedostaju.

55 Možda bi točnije bilo nazivati ovaj ukop grobom ispod sjeverne prostorije prizemlja *westwerka*. Naime, sarkofag jest pronađen unutar okvira njezinih zidova i u literaturi su prisutna različita tumačenja o odnosu groba i zidova oko njega, no čini se da im ipak prethodi. Na to ukazuju već podaci iz izvještaja o iskopavanju koje donosi Frano Radić (1896, 71), prema kojima se doznaje da je sarkofag naden prilikom pretraživanja najdublje sloja lokaliteta te da je bio okrenut „uzduž kapele, nešto malo navinut prema sredini bazilike“. Da je sarkofag bio ukopan nakon gradnje crkve i *westwerka*, trebalo bi očekivati njegovu pravilnu orijentaciju prema jednome od zidova. Štoviše, da je bio postavljen u već postojećoj grobnoj kapeli u prizemlju, vjerojatnije bi bilo da se nalazio na razini nekadašnje podnice, kao što je bio slučaj sa sarkofagom u južnoj prostoriji (za potonji sarkofag v. Marun 1898, 113, 116–118.). Ovakvo, ukopan u najdubljem sloju i lagano zakošen, najvjerojatnije je pripadao istome sloju grobova kao i presvođene zidane grobnice te grobovi u drvenim lijesovima u običnim zemljanim rakama (tako smatra Jurčević 2011, 133–135. Usp. i Milošević 2000c, 118–119, gdje se navodi kako su svi navedeni grobovi pronađeni na otprilike 3 metra dubine.), što je i dodatan prilog dataciji ovih ostruga prije sredine 9. stoljeća. Za detaljniju raspravu o ovoj problematici v. Bilogrivić 2016, 128–131 i tamo navedenu raniju literaturu.

56 Usp. Petrinc 2006, 27; Jurčević 2009, 68. Također Jurčević 2011, 133, gdje se najmlađi grobovi s karolinškim nalazima datiraju u dvadesete i tridesete godine 9. stoljeća. Ovakvoj dataciji groba podno sjeverne prostorije *westwerka* svakako ide u prilog i novoistraženi grob 4 s visinske utvrde na Brekinjovoj kosi kod Bojne, južno od Gline. Pokojnik, doduše, nije bio ukopan u sarkofagu, nego u prostranoj grobnoj raci s drvenom konstrukcijom, ali pokretni nalazi pokazuju zapanjujuće sličnosti s biskupijskima. Pronađeni su tako: privjesak od gorskoga kristala optočen zlatnim filigranskim ukrasom, gotovo identičan danas izgubljenome primjerku iz biskupijskoga groba; zlatnik Konstantina V. i Lava IV; ostatak tkanine sa zlatnim nitima; raskošno ukrašene pozlaćene bronzane ostruge i pripadajuća garnitura (Madiraca et al. 2017, 164–182). Provedene ¹⁴C analize ostataka drvene grobne komore pružaju širi datacijski raspon (cal AD 791±60 i 829±42), prema autorima objave između približno 788. i 852. godine (isto, 188–191), što se ugrubo poklapa s ovdje predstavljenim datacijama horizonta Biskupija-Crkvina. Da bi prije bila riječ o drugoj polovini ovoga raspona, pokazuju ostruge i njihova garnitura, ukrašene gusto izvedenom karolinškom vegetabilnom ornamentikom, kakva se ponajviše susreće u razdoblju središnje trećine 9. stoljeća (barem koliko je vidljivo prema fotografijama predmeta prije konzervatorskog postupka: isto, 170–172, sl. 10–12; za donekle analogne motive i dataciju usp. stilsku grupu V provera Lennartsson 1997–1998, 511, T. 6: 2, 19: 1).

49 Last third of the 8th century: Giesler 1974, 528–532; Wachowski 1983, 163–167. Last third of the 8th century and first third of the 9th: Schulze-Dörlamm 1993, 564–565, 568; Petrinc 2006, 26; Robak 2015, 312, n. 3 (Robak, however, limits the dating to the period around 790–820/830). First half of the 9th century: Werner 1978–1979, 227–237; Menghin 1980, 254; Kleemann 2002, 289–291; Belošević 2007, 276, 282–284. Kleemann also dates the horizon to after the middle of the 9th century.

50 Cf. Bilogrivić 2011, 87–88.

51 Wachowski 1983.

52 For the relation between graves and architecture cf. Petrinc 2006, 21; Jurčević 2011, 130–133.

53 For the sequence of burials at Crkvina in Biskupija cf. also Jurčević 2009, 67–68.

54 Petrinc 2005, 188; 2009, 171. It is important to stress that these tombs are not reused constructions from Late Antiquity (although they could have been built on such models), but original early medieval ones, created precisely for the deceased found inside them. Thus they served as additional indicators of status along with the already rich grave goods within them. The same pertains also to similar tombs at Popovića Dolovi in Biskupija, Crkvina in Gornji Koljani, and Greblje in Ostrovica. Cf. also Kleemann 2010, 83, n. 28; Jurčević 2011, 133. For a different opinion see Milošević 2000c, 119, 123, where it is also presumed that there had been a smaller Early Christian cemetery at Crkvina in Biskupija, connected with the nearby church at Katića Bajami. Concrete finds that would point to such a conclusion are, however, missing.

ju ukopa primaran kontekst. Naime, premda su između pojedinih primjeraka ostruga vjerojatne određene kronološke razlike, koje se obično predlažu na temelju morfoloških kriterija, jednako je moguće i da je većina karolinških ostruga hrvatskoga tipa, jednostavnije ili raskošnije ukrašenih, nastala u vrlo kratkom razdoblju i možda čak u istim radionicama.⁵⁷ Tako bi i na područje današnje Hrvatske te Bosne i Hercegovine pristigle u relativno kratkom razdoblju s kraja 8. i početka 9. stoljeća, gdje su pojedine mogle biti u upotrebi sve do sredine 9. stoljeća.⁵⁸ Budući da su u grobovima s mačevima, kao i u sarkofagu, bili pokopani odrasli muškarci, izgledno je da su ovdje takvi predmeti bili u njihovu posjedu određeno vrijeme, kod pojedinih lako moguće i više od 10 – 20 godina. Kosturni ostaci pokojnika iz ovih grobova, na žalost, nisu sačuvani pa se o njihovoj točnoj dobi ne može ništa konkretnije zaključiti.

Promjene u grobnom inventaru, koje se događaju u istom razdoblju, mogu se također sagledati na više načina. Svakako, postupna je redukcija grobnih priloga u cjelini, među ostalim, i posljedica čvršćeg prodiranja kršćanstva u društvu, kao što i jest generalno uobičajena praksa kad se usporede groblja 8./9. s grobljima kasnijih stoljeća. Ne može se, međutim, potpuno isključiti ni mogućnost da je barem dio pokojnika, pripadnika elite, bio pokršten vrlo rano, možda već na prijelazu sa 8. u 9. stoljeće, a da je prilaganje karolinškog oružja i ostruga bilo dio strategije stvaranja i komuniciranja identiteta, važno zbog nastavljanja veze s ranijim tradicijama.⁵⁹ U tom su slučaju križevi na pojedinim predmetima (ostruge iz sarkofaga ili pak petlja garniture za zakopčavanje ostruga iz groba 4)⁶⁰ te novac u funkciji obola (također s prikazom križa) doista mogli biti pokazatelji kršćanske pripadnosti pokojnika, kako je to bio predložio još Joachim Werner.⁶¹ I drvene vjedrice, priložene u grobove 1, 2, 6 i 8, mogle su imati kršćansko simboličko značenje.⁶² Naravno, jednako je tako moguće i da po-

level of the westwork (Pl. 3: 3, 4: 1),⁵⁵ probably from the end of the first third, or the very beginning of the second, of the 9th century at the latest.⁵⁶

When speaking of graves with Carolingian swords and spurs from Crkvina in Biskupija, and their mutual differences, one must bear in mind the difference between the time of creation, i.e. production, of these objects and the time of their interment. Typological and stylistic analyses of objects primarily define the time of their production and most frequent use, while for dating a burial its context is primary. Although certain chronological differences between certain examples of spurs, usually proposed on the basis of morphological criteria, are probable, it is equally possible that the majority of the Carolingian spurs of Croatian type, whether simply or lavishly decorated, were produced in a very short period and maybe in the same workshops.⁵⁷ Thus they would also have arrived in the territory of present-day Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina in the relatively short period of the end of the 8th century and the beginning of the 9th, where some of them could have been in use right through to the middle of the 9th century.⁵⁸ Since adult men were buried in the graves with

57 Usp. Jurčević 2011.

58 Usp. Bilogrivić 2009, 149–150; Jurčević 2011, 137.

59 Prisutnost oružja, ali i brojnih drugih priloga u grobu, ne mora biti pokazatelj poganstva. U ranosrednjovjekovnim crkvenim tekstovima nema izričitih zabrana polaganja priloga u grobove, dapače, ono se često tolerira. Tako se ni u popisu zabranjenih poganskih običaja, *Indiculus superstitionum et paganismorum*, nastalom oko 800. godine u Mainzu, ne spominju grobni prilozima, nego prije svega različiti dijelovi pogrebnih obreda vezani uz ples, pjesmu, hranu i piće i sl. *Capitularia regum Francorum*, br. 108, 222–223. Usp. Härke 2001, 27–28; Schulze-Dörrlamm 2010, 369. Naposljetku, dovoljno je spomenuti nemali broj merovinških grobova s prilozima unutar crkava, od kojih mnogi sadrže i oružje.

60 Milošević 2000a, 213, 225, IV. 42b, IV. 53b.

61 Werner 1978–1979, 229. V. i Belošević 1997, 112. Za novac u funkciji obola kao kršćanski običaj preuzet od Franaka, usp. Petrinc 2009, 198–199; Schulze-Dörrlamm 2010, 368. Slično je i Milošević 2005, 459, upozorio kako prisustvo oružja i drugih priloga u biskupijskim grobovima ne mora biti pokazatelj poganstva pokojnika, pridajući prednost simbolu križa na njima te na zlatnicima.

62 Za opširnu raspravu o drvenim vjericama kao grobnim prilozima, v. Kurasiński 2015, osobito 155–165, gdje autor naglašava mnogostrukost njihove simbolike u pogrebnom kontekstu i nužnost poznavanja sadržaja pohranjenog u njima za preciznije tumačenje. O vjericama kao mogućim kršćanskim prilozima u ranosrednjovjekovnim grobovima raspravlja Tomičić 2003. Wamers 1994, 30–32, navodi mogućnost da je drvena vjedrica iz spomenutoga groba pod tumulom u Haithabuu mogla biti povezana s kršćanskim obredima kao recipient za posvećenu vodu, možda korištena i pri krštenju. Također, pretpostavlja joj moguće karolinško podrijetlo. Doduše, ova vjedrica ima križoliki željezni okov na kojemu su urezana četiri manja križa, što njezino tumačenje u takvom svjetlu čini prilično izvjesnijim nego u hrvatskim slučajevima, gdje su okovi vjedrica mahom neukrašeni.

55 It would maybe be more accurate to call this burial a grave beneath the northern chamber of the ground level of the westwork. The sarcophagus was found within the framework of its walls, to be sure, and various interpretations of the relation of the grave to the surrounding walls are present in scholarly literature, but it seems that it actually does precede them. This is implied already by the information from the excavation report made by Frano Radić (1896, 71), according to which we know that the sarcophagus was found during research on the lowermost layer at the site, and that it had been positioned “alongside the chapel, slightly turned towards the middle of the basilica”. Had the sarcophagus been buried after the building of the church and the westwork, its correct orientation to one of the walls should be expected. Moreover, had it been placed inside an already existing grave chamber at ground level, it would more probably have been positioned on its original floor level, as was the case with the sarcophagus in the southern chamber. (For the latter sarcophagus see Marun 1898, 113, 116–118.) Being as it was, buried in the lowermost layer and slightly tilted, it most probably belonged to the same stratum of graves as the vaulted tombs and the coffin burials in plain earthen graves (considered so in Jurčević 2011, 133–135. Cf. also Milošević 2000c, 118–119, where it is stated that all of these graves were found at a depth of approx. 3 m), which is an additional argument for dating these spurs to before the middle of the 9th century. For a more detailed discussion of these problems see Bilogrivić 2016, 128–131, and the earlier literature cited therein.

56 Cf. Petrinc 2006, 27; Jurčević 2009, 68. Also Jurčević 2011, 133, where the youngest graves with Carolingian spurs are dated to the 20s and 30s of the 9th century. Such a dating of the grave beneath the northern chamber of the ground level of the westwork is further supported by the recently excavated and published grave 4 in the hillfort at Brekinjova Kosa, near Bojna, south of Glina. The deceased there was not buried in a sarcophagus, though, but rather in a spacious grave with a wooden construction. However, the grave goods show striking similarities to those from Biskupija. The finds consist of a rock-crystal pendant with gold filigree decoration, almost identical to the now lost example from the Biskupija sarcophagus; gold coin of Constantine V and Leo IV; remains of fabric with golden threads; and lavishly decorated gilt bronze spurs and accompanying strap set (Madiraca et al. 2018, 164–182). The ¹⁴C analyses of the remains of the wooden grave chamber allow for a wider date range (cal AD 791±60 and 829±42), according to the authors approximately 788–852 AD (*Ibid.*, 188–191), which roughly concurs with the above-presented datings of the Biskupija-Crkvina horizon. That the second half of this range would be more probable is shown by the spurs and their strapping sets, decorated with densely executed Carolingian floral ornamentation, such as is mostly found during the middle third of the 9th century (inasmuch as is visible in the photographs of these objects before conservation: *Ibid.*, 170–172, Fig. 10–12; for somewhat analogous motifs and dating cf. *Stilgruppe V* in Lennartsson 1997–1998, 511, Pl. 6: 2, 19: 1).

57 Cf. Jurčević 2011.

58 Cf. Bilogrivić 2009, 149–150; Jurčević 2011, 137.

kojnici u grobovima s mačevima, tipičnim predstavnicima horizonta s poganskim značajkama pokapanja, doista nisu bili pokršteni, no za one u grobovima koji kao priloge sadrže uglavnom samo ostruge, ipak se osnovanije može pretpostaviti kršćanska pripadnost. Tim više što ti grobovi najvjerojatnije nastaju u vrijeme nakon izdavanja novog kapitulara (*Capitulare missorum generale* iz 802. godine) u kojemu su vjernost caru i Carstvu povezani s vjernošću Bogu i Crkvi te se od podanika traži strogo slijedenje crkvenog nauka i propisa.⁶³

S druge strane, Jörg Kleemann smatra kako je redukcija priloga u grobovima sjeverozapadne Njemačke odraz preuzimanja novog načina ispoljavanja društvene reprezentacije u okviru ukopa, gdje se pokapanje bez priloga preuzima kao običaj iz susjednoga Franačkog Kraljevstva. Lokalna je elita s takvim pokapanjem mogla započeti već i prije franačkih pohoda i predstavljala je predložak za ostalo stanovništvo.⁶⁴ Takvo bi se objašnjenje možda moglo odnositi i na područje buduće ranosrednjovjekovne Hrvatske, ali tek nakon početka 9. stoljeća, a ne u vrijeme prvih kontakata s Francima, kada je prilaganje u grobovima najizraženije. Također, u pogledu franačkog širenja kršćanstva, važno je imati na umu i ideološki aspekt toga procesa, kako za istočnoslavensko područje objašnjava Peter Heather. Ono je bilo normalna i očekivana funkcija kršćanskog cara, u ovom slučaju Karla Velikoga i Ludovika Pobožnog, no isto je tako izglednije da će pokršteni Slaveni (ili drugi „narodi“) ideološki prije prihvatiti vlast kršćanskog cara negoli poganski.⁶⁵ Nastavno na to, Heather ističe kako je kontrola crkvenih struktura u slavenskim zemljama automatski dovodila Franke u položaj kontrole kombinacije odnosa pokroviteljstva i ekonomskih prava poput desetine. Jednako je tako pokrštavanje pomagalo i slavenskim elitama, odnosno njihovim vođama koji su nastojali učvrstiti svoju vlast i podići je na višu razinu. Kako su poganska vjerovanja povezana s tradicionalnim društvenim i političkim strukturama pogodnim manjim lokalnim skupinama, takav je sustav ograničavao objedinjavanje vlasti u jednoj osobi na širem prostoru. Ranosrednjovjekovno je kršćanstvo, nasuprot tomu, donosilo uzvišeniji koncept kraljevstva, a s time i ideološki podlogu lokalnim vođama za promjenu načina na koji ih podanici doživljavaju te ojačanje svoje vlasti. To, naravno, nije značilo nužno preuzimanje cijeloga kršćanskog „paketa“, nego iskorištavanje pojedinih elemenata.⁶⁶ Franački utjecaji u pokrštavanju i kristijanizaciji dalmatinskoga zaleđa su nedvojbeni, a njihovi tragovi brojni, kako u manjim liturgijskim predmetima tako i u crkvenoj arhitekturi i skulpturi, organizaciji samostana i drugdje. No vratimo se na temu ovoga članka i pogledajmo kakva je situacija na drugim grobljima.

63 McKitterick 2008, 269–270. Iako područje Dalmacije tada nije bilo sastavni dio Franačkog Carstva, u smislu u kojem je to primjerice bila Istra, ne znači da se kapitularom propisani odnosi nisu barem očekivali.

64 Kleemann 2010, 87–88.

65 Heather 1997, 180.

66 Isto, 180–181.

swords, as well as in the sarcophagus, it is likely that here such objects had been in their possession for a certain time, in some cases easily for more than 10 – 20 years. Skeletal remains of the deceased from these graves have unfortunately not been preserved, so nothing more can be said of their exact age.

Changes in the grave inventory occurring in the same period can also be considered in more ways than one. The gradual reduction of grave goods is certainly a consequence of stronger penetration of Christianity into society, as really is the general practice if we compare the graves of the 8th/9th centuries with those of later ones. Still, we can not rule out the possibility that at least some of the deceased, members of the elite, were baptised very early on, maybe already at the turn of the 9th century, and that the enclosing of Carolingian weapons and spurs was part of the strategy of creating and communicating identity, important for the continuation of the connection with earlier traditions.⁵⁹ In that case the crosses on certain objects (spurs from the sarcophagus or the loop of the spur strap set from grave 4)⁶⁰ and coins serving as oboli (also with a representation of a cross) could in fact have been indicators of the Christian affiliation of the deceased, as proposed long ago by Joachim Werner.⁶¹ The wooden buckets found in graves 1, 2, 6 and 8 could also have had Christian symbolic meaning.⁶² Of course, it is equally possible that the deceased in the graves with swords, typical representatives of the horizon with pagan burial characteristics, were not indeed baptised, but for those in graves which contain mostly only spurs as goods, Christian affiliation can be presumed with more soundness. The more so because those graves most probably came to be in a period after the issue of a new capitulary (*Capitulare missorum generale* of the year 802) in which loyalty to the Emperor

59 The presence of weapons, as well as many other grave goods, does not necessarily have to be an indicator of paganism. There are no explicit prohibitions on the enclosing of goods in a grave in early medieval Church writings; in fact, it is often tolerated. Likewise, in the *Indiculus superstitionum et paganismorum*, a list of prohibited pagan customs written around 800 in Mainz, there is mention not of grave goods but primarily various parts of funeral rites associated with dance, song, food and drink, etc.: *Capitularia regum Francorum*, no. 108, 222–223. Cf. Schulze-Dörrlamm 2010, 369; Härke 2001, 27–28. After all, it is sufficient to mention the not insignificant number of Merovingian graves with grave goods within churches, many of which also contain weapons.

60 Milošević 2000a, 213, 225, IV. 42b, IV. 53b.

61 Werner 1978–1979, 229. See also Belošević 1997, 112. For coins with the function of oboli as a Christian custom adopted from the Franks cf. Schulze-Dörrlamm 2010, 368; Petrinc 2009, 198–199. Milošević 2005, 459, already similarly emphasised that the presence of weapons and other goods in graves in Biskupija does not have to be an indicator of the deceased's paganism, giving precedence to the cross symbols on them and on the gold coins.

62 For an extensive discussion on wooden buckets as grave goods see Kurasiński 2015, esp. 155–165, where the author accentuates their multivalent symbolics in burial contexts and the necessity of knowing the content stored in them for more precise interpretations. Buckets as possible Christian goods in early-mediaeval graves are discussed in Tomić 2003. Wamers 1994, 30–32, notes the possibility that the wooden bucket from the above-mentioned grave under the barrow in Haithabu might have been connected with Christian rituals as a receptacle for holy water, maybe even used for baptism. He also presumes its possible Carolingian origin. To be sure, this bucket has a cross-shaped iron mount with four smaller crosses incised, making its interpretation in such light rather more certain than in Croatian cases, where the mounts are generally undecorated.

Druga groblja

Najsličniji Biskupiji su Koljani, značajni prije svega zbog svoje strateške važnosti prijelaza preko Cetine, no velika koncentracija (luksuznih) karolinških nalaza, kao i nešto kasnija predromanička crkva, pokazuju da je riječ o jednome od središnjih mjesta nastajuće kneževine. Valja naglasiti da je zbog nepoznatoga preciznog konteksta većine nalaza s ovoga lokaliteta uvijek potrebna zadržka po pitanju konačnih zaključaka.⁶⁷ U Koljanima se nalaze tri mikrolokacije, na kojima su ukupno pronađena tri karolinška mača, brojne ostruge i crkva tlocrta najvjerojatnije analognog biskupijskoj.⁶⁸ Na prvome je mjestu grob 1 s položaja Vukovića most, na lijevoj obali Cetine, u kojem su uz mač tipa K pronađene i karolinške ostruge hrvatskoga tipa s narebrenim četvrtastim kopčama na krajevima krakova te pripadajućim jezičcima garnitura oblika slova „U“ i petljama s ovalnom pločicom (T. 5: 1), a na pojasu pokojnika nalazio se cjevasti pojasni okov. Uz ovaj grob otkrivena su još dva, gotovo bez priloga – samo kremen i kresivo u jednome grobu.⁶⁹ Izravna je paralela grobu 1 grob 4 s groblja u Rešetarici kod Livna, s mačem tipa K sa sedam režnjeva te analognim ostrugama i ostružnim garniturama, a od ostalih priloga tu su i dva noža, od kojih jedan sklopivi, te kresivo (T. 5: 2).⁷⁰ Navedenim je ostrugama analogan i par iz groba 3A s lokaliteta Stranče-Gorica u Vinodolu (T. 5: 3), s razlikom da njihove kopče na krajevima krakova nisu narebrene, nego glatke. U tome grobu nema drugih nalaza karolinške provenijencije, već su prisutni uobičajeni prilozima horizonta s poganskim značajkama pokapanja (keramička posuda, noževi, kresiva i kremen).⁷¹ Na groblju na Crkvini u Biskupiji jednake garniture potječu iz groba 88, dođuše s drugačijim tipom ostruga. Zbog svega navedenog, čini se mogućim grob 1 s Vukovića mosta smjestiti otprilike u vrijeme između prve i druge faze biskupijskih grobova.⁷² Prilaganje mača povezuje ga s prvom fazom, dok karakteristike ostruga i manjak drugih priloga upućuju na sljedeću.

Drugi je mač pronađen prije desetak godina na desnoj obali Cetine, na položaju Slankovac u Donjim Koljanima. Radi se također o tipu K, i to o luksuznom primjerku, čije su nakrsnica i jabučica ukrašene tauširanjem mesinganom žicom. Istim su materijalom izvedeni i simboli na sječivu mača – križ i trolisni čvor. Simbolika prvog motiva je neupitna, dok se ovakav čvor u svjetlu križa možda može povezati sa sv. Trojstvom. Tim više što se taj motiv pojavljuje često u crkvenim kontekstima, kako na sitnijim liturgijskim

and the Empire was tied to fidelity to God and the Church, and strict adherence to the teachings and regulations of the Church was demanded of the subjects.⁶³

On the other hand, Jörg Kleemann sees the reduction of grave goods in northwestern Germany as a reflection of acceptance of a new way to express social representation within a burial, where burial without grave goods was appropriated as a custom from the neighbouring Frankish Kingdom. The local elite could have commenced such burials even before the Frankish conquest and presented a template for the remaining population.⁶⁴ Such an explanation might possibly pertain to the territory of the future Croatian Dukedom, too, but more likely only after the beginning of the 9th century, not at the time of the first contacts with the Franks, when the grave-good custom was most prominent. Likewise, in regard of the Frankish expansion of Christianity, it is important to bear in mind the ideological aspect of that process, as explained by Peter Heather for the eastern Slavic area. It was a normal and expected function of a Christian emperor, in this case Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, but it is also more likely that Christian Slavs (or other “peoples”, for that matter) would ideologically sooner accept the authority of a Christian emperor than pagan ones.⁶⁵ Heather further stresses that the control of Church structures in Slavic lands automatically brought the Franks into a position of control over a combination of political patronage and economic rights, such as tithing. Christianisation also helped the Slavic elites, i.e. their leaders, who sought to affirm their authority and raise it to a higher level. Since pagan beliefs were tied to traditional social and political structures appropriate for smaller local groups, such a system limited the unification of authority over a wider area in one person. Contrary to that, early medieval Christianity brought with it heightened conceptions of kingship, and with that also the ideological basis for local leaders to change the way in which their subjects saw them, and to strengthen their authority. This, of course, did not necessarily presume the acceptance of the entire Christian “package”, but rather the utilisation of its individual elements.⁶⁶ Frankish influences in baptism and Christianisation of the Dalmatian hinterland are undisputed and their traces numerous: as in smaller liturgical objects, thus also in church architecture and sculpture, in the organisation of monasteries, and elsewhere. But let us return to the narrower subject of this paper and observe the situation at other sites.

67 Usp. Petrincec 2009, 20–21, 80–81.

68 Koljansku je crkvu relativno nedavno detaljno obradio Jurčević 2009. O strateškoj važnosti položaja u Koljanima v. Milošević 2012a, 460–461; 2016b, 209.

69 Petrincec 2009, 20–21.

70 Vrdoljak 1988, 146, 184, T. XVII. Ni u ovome grobu, kao ni u grobu s Vukovića mosta, nije pronađena keramička posuda niti vjedrica.

71 Cetinić 2010, 4–5.

72 U prilog takvoj interpretaciji može se navesti i pripadajuća garnitura pojasa za nošenje mača iz koljanskoga groba, koja sadrži i trolisni/djetelinasti okov, odnosno razdjelnik. Takav tip razdjelnika nešto je mlađi od onoga pronađenog u grobu 6 s Crkvine u Biskupiji, u obliku slova T, makar su oba tipa dijelom korištena istovremeno. Trolisni su okovi korišteni kroz veći dio 9. stoljeća, najintenzivnije tijekom njegove središnje trećine, ali za precizniju dataciju pojedinih primjeraka uvijek je presudan uži kontekst nalaza (Ungerma 2011, 578–584, za nalaze iz Biskupije i Koljana osobito 580–581; 2015, 259, 261–263; Robak 2017, 113–115).

63 McKitterick 2008, 269–270. Although Dalmatian territory was not an integral part of the Frankish Empire, in the same sense as Istria, for example, this does not mean that the relations regulated by the capitulary were not at least expected.

64 Kleemann 2010, 87–88.

65 Heather 1997, 180.

66 *Ibid.*, 180–181.

predmetima⁷³ tako i na crkvenom namještaju.⁷⁴ Ovi simboli mogu biti još jedan prilog raspravi o problematičnosti izravnog povezivanja prilaganja oružja s religijskim nazorima pokojnika, odnosno onih koji ga pokapaju. U svakom slučaju, sječivo je ovoga mača ponajbolje sačuvano među svim do sada pronađenim karolinškim mačevima s područja Hrvatske te Bosne i Hercegovine, a i mač u cjelini spada među najluksuznije primjerke. Na žalost, radi se o slučajnom nalazu i poznato je samo da potječe iz groba. S njim je pronađen i srebrni, mesingom ukrašeni pojasni jezičac sa završetkom u obliku pupoljka.⁷⁵ Kako ovi nalazi još uvijek nisu u potpunosti objavljeni,⁷⁶ s dalekosežnijim zaključcima treba pričekati i za sada se može tek pretpostaviti da pripadaju istome horizontu i razdoblju kao i mač s Vukovića mosta.

Sličan zaključak vrijedi i za treći mač iz Koljana, o kojemu gotovo da i nema podataka. Naime, u literaturi se odavno govori o maču tipa X koji je pronađen vjerojatno na Crkvini u Gornjim Koljanima, no darovan je etiopskom caru Haileu Selassieu prilikom njegova posjeta Splitu 1954. godine te je bio poznat samo s kasnijeg crteža.⁷⁷ Prije nekoliko je godina, međutim, u Muzeju hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika u Splitu pronađena fotografija snimljena prilikom prezentacije mača za darivanje, prema kojoj je prilično očito da se ipak ne radi o tipu X, nego možda radije o tipu H.⁷⁸ Time bi spadao u uobičajeni kontekst ranijega karolinškog razdoblja, kao i druga dva mača iz Koljana. Međutim, u Arhivu Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu nedavno sam naišao na jednu zanimljivu fotografiju,⁷⁹ na kojoj se nalaze dva mača iz Koljana – jedan je spomenuti tip K s Vukovića mosta, a drugi bi, prema natpisu Z. Vinskog na poleđini fotografije, trebao biti upravo mač darovan H. Selassieu. Prema svemu sudeći, to je i fotografija prema kojoj je nastao crtež iz publikacije Z. Vinskog 1983. U svakom slučaju,

73 Primjerice, na srebrnoj liturgijskoj špatuli s pozlaćenom žličicom iz Mainz, 8./9. stoljeće, na kojoj su četiri takva simbola postavljena oko središnjeg križa (Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009, 190–191, Abb. 31); također i na srebrnoj lučnoj fibuli jednaka krakova iz Camona, dép. Somme, u Francuskoj, 9. stoljeće, koja naravno nije liturgijski predmet, ali su ponovno po četiri ovakva simbola postavljena oko središnjeg križnog motiva, na svakoj od nogu fibule (isto, 178, 181, Abb. 23/1). Istovjetan se simbol, samo izduženijeg oblika, nalazi i na gornjoj strani nakrsnice mača Bb iz Haithabua. Uzevši u obzir cjelokupnu kršćansku simboliku ukrasa na njegovu balčaku, Wamers 1994, 13, je stoga predložio moguće tumačenje simbola upravo kao simbola sv. Trojstva.

74 Samo neki od doista brojnih primjera dvije su stranice krstioničkog ciborija pulske katedrale i stranica oltarnog ciborija crkve sv. Felicite iz pulskoga predgrada, 9. stoljeće (Milošević 2000a, 62–63, I. 51–52); plutej oltarne katedrale u Krku, 8./9. stoljeće (isto, 126, III. 8c); stranica ciborija iz crkve sv. Krševana u Zadru, 9. stoljeće (isto, 166, III. 53).

75 Milošević 2012a, 461–463.

76 Iako je Ante Milošević ovome maču posvetio čak tri članka, riječ je o praktički istovjetnim tekstovima (Milošević 2012a; 2016a; 2016b) u kojima se, na žalost, ne donose osnovni podaci o dimenzijama mača i jezičca. Autor mač iz Slankovca interpretira kao proizvod skandinavskih radionica, s čime se teško složiti. Za detaljniju argumentaciju njegove karolinške provenijencije v. Bilogrivić 2018a, osobito 90–94.

77 Jelovina 1976, 116–117, 140, bilj. 173a; Vinski 1983, 12, T. III: 1.

78 Na takvu mogućnost upućuje naizgled trokutasta jabučica. Duže bočne strane nakrsnice i jabučice doimaju se, doduše, prilično ravnima, a ne zaobljenima, kakve bi se očekivale kod balčaka tipa H. V. također Milošević 2012a, 460, 462; 2016a, 244–245; 2016b, 210–211; Bilogrivić 2013, 77–78.

79 AAMZ 210-4. Fotografija će, uz nešto detaljnije razmatranje ovoga slučaja, biti objavljena u Bilogrivić 2019b, u zborniku posvećenom životu i znanstvenom radu Zdenka Vinskog.

Other cemeteries

The most similar to Biskupija is Koljani, significant in the first place for the strategic importance of its crossing of the River Cetina; but the large concentration of (luxurious) Carolingian finds, as well as the slightly later pre-Romanesque church, show that here also was one of the central places of the emerging dukedom. It has to be stressed, though, that, due to the unknown precise context of most of the finds from this site, a restraint from definitive conclusions is always necessary.⁶⁷ There are three micro-locations here at which a total of three Carolingian swords were found, as well as numerous spurs and a church with a layout most probably analogous to that at Biskupija.⁶⁸ In the first place is grave 1 at the site of Vukovića Most, in which a type-K sword was found along with Carolingian spurs of Croatian type with ribbed rectangular buckles at the ends and pertaining U-shaped strap ends and loops with an oval plate (Pl. 5: 1). On the waist of the deceased there was a tubular belt fitting. Two more graves were found next to this one, practically without grave goods – only a flint and steel in one of them.⁶⁹ A direct parallel for grave 1 is grave 4 at the cemetery in Rešetarica, near Livno, containing a type-K sword with a 7-lobed pommel and analogous spurs and strap sets, two knives, one of which is foldable, and a flint steel (Pl. 5: 2).⁷⁰ Analogous to these spurs is also a pair from grave 3A at the site of Stranče-Gorica in Vinodol (Pl. 5: 3), with the difference of having smooth buckles at the ends of the branches instead of ribbed ones. In this grave there were no other finds of Carolingian provenance, but instead the usual goods of the horizon with pagan burial characteristics (a clay pot, knives, flints and flint steels).⁷¹ From the cemetery of Crkvina in Biskupija, an equal set of strap elements comes from grave 88, albeit with a different type of spurs. On account of all this it seems possible to set grave 1 at Vukovića Most approximately in the period between the first two phases of the graves in Biskupija.⁷² The enclosing of a sword ties it to the first phase, while the characteristics of the spurs and the lack of other goods suggest the second phase.

The second sword was found over a decade ago on the right bank of the Cetina, at the site of Slankovac in Donji Koljani. It is also of type K and a luxurious example at that, with the crossguard

67 Cf. Petrinc 2009, 20–21, 80–81.

68 The church at Gornji Koljani was relatively recently thoroughly discussed in Jurčević 2009. For the strategic importance of the positions in Koljani see Milošević 2012a, 460–461; 2016b, 209.

69 Petrinc 2009, 20–21.

70 Vrdoljak 1988, 146, 184, Pl. XVII. In this grave, just as in the grave at Vukovića Most, there was no clay pot or wooden bucket.

71 Cetinić 2010, 4–5.

72 In support of such an interpretation, the accompanying sword belt set from the Koljani grave can be added, comprising also a trefoil/clover-shaped mount, i.e. divider. This type of divider is slightly later than the T-shaped one found in grave 6 at Crkvina in Biskupija, although both types were partly also simultaneously in use. Trefoil mounts were used throughout most of the 9th century, most intensively during its central third, but the specific context of the find is always crucial for precise dating of individual examples (Ungermaier 2011, 578–584, for the finds from Biskupija and Koljani esp. 580–581; 2015, 259, 261–263; Robak 2017, 113–115).

potonji mač nije tipa X, a ni tipa H. Koliko se može zaključiti iz fotografije, njegova je jabučica dvodijelna te na prvi pogled više djeluje kao Petersenov tip N,⁸⁰ odnosno Geibigov kombinacijski tip 8,⁸¹ premda se ne može sasvim isključiti ni slabša mogućnost da se radi o tipu K korozijom znatno oštećene krune jabučice. Ovdje se, naravno, postavlja i pitanje je li na objema fotografijama uopće riječ o istome maču. Bez neposrednog proučavanja „etiopskog“ primjerka, nemoguće je donijeti definitivni zaključak.

Kako god, svakako kasniji od grobova s mačevima grobovi su s Crkvine u Gornjim Koljanima u kojima su pronađene samo ostruge. Na žalost, o njima ne postoji gotovo nikakva dokumentacija iz vremena istraživanja krajem 19. stoljeća pa su nepoznati podaci o točnom kontekstu nalaza.⁸² Među više primjeraka s ovog lokaliteta ističu se dva para masivnih brončanih ostruga s četvrtastim pločicama s osam zakovica na krajevima krakova (T. 9: 4), morfološki analognih onima iz sarkofaga na Crkvi u Biskupiji, uz puno jednostavniji ukras (šrafirani trokuti na bazi trna).⁸³ Garniture za zakopčavanje sastoje se pak od jezičaca oblika slova „U“ i petlji s ovalnom pločicom, poput već opisanih iz groba kod Vukovića mosta, s razlikom što ovi jezičci nisu zašiljeni pri vrhu. Prema analognim grobovima iz Biskupije, moguće je pretpostaviti da uz ove ostruge u grobovima drugih priloga nije bilo, a same grobove datirati otprilike u vrijeme groba u sarkofagu s Crkvine u Biskupiji. Dakle, gledajući lokalitete u cjelini, očite su velike sličnosti s Crkvinom u Biskupiji. Prisutna je prva faza grobova s mačevima, zatim grobovi samo s ostrugama, a uz crkvu na Crkvi u Gornjim Koljanima pronađene su i zidane grobnice, vjerojatno nalik onima iz Biskupije.⁸⁴ Na kraju, tu su i velike sličnosti dviju crkava, ne samo u tlocrtu već i u uređenju interijera, odnosno crkvenom namještaju.⁸⁵

U svjetlu ovih lokaliteta moguće je tumačiti i druga groblja, poput onoga na Ždrijacu u Ninu, gdje karolinški nalazi često pripadaju najbogatijim grobovima unutar groblja, no puno su jednostavniji i skromniji u odnosu na biskupijske i koljanske. Ostruge su tipološki analogne obrađenima, no izrađene od željeza i većinom neukrašene. Ističu se one iz groba 161, s mjedanim limom oko baze trna ukrašenim šrafiranim trokutima, narebrenim kopčama na krajevima krakova i pticolikim jezičcima garnitura za nošenje (T. 6: 2).⁸⁶ Najbliža analogija su im ostruge iz groba 52 groblja Kašić-Maklinovo brdo,⁸⁷ a sa Ždrijaca morfološki gotovo identična ostruga iz dvojnoga groba 74, kojoj doduše nedostaje mjedena oplata trna. Ova je ostruga također bila jedina u grobu i prona-

and pommel decorated with inlaid brass wire. The symbols on the blade, a cross and a trefoil knot, were made from the same material. The symbolics of the first motif are unquestionable, while in its light the knot might possibly be connected with the Holy Trinity. The more so because the latter motif often appears in church contexts: as on smaller liturgical objects,⁷³ so too on church furniture.⁷⁴ These symbols can be another addition to the discussion on the problematic nature of directly connecting the placing of weapons in graves with the religious views of the deceased, i.e. those that buried them. Be that as it may, the blade of this sword is one of the best preserved among all of the Carolingian swords found in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the entire sword is one of the most luxurious examples. Unfortunately it was a chance find, and what is known about it is only that it came from a grave. Together with the sword, a silver belt tongue with a bud-shaped ending, and decorated with brass, was also found.⁷⁵ Since these finds have not yet been fully published,⁷⁶ we have to delay any far-reaching conclusions and for now can only presume that they belong to the same horizon and time period as the sword from Vukovića Most.

A similar conclusion might also pertain to the third sword from Koljani, about which there is practically no information whatsoever. In scholarly literature there has long been mention of a sword of type X probably found at Crkvina in Gornji Koljani, but given as a gift to the Ethiopian emperor Haile Selassie during his visit to Split in 1954, so it was known only from a later drawing.⁷⁷ Several years ago, however, a photograph taken during the presentation of the sword for gift-giving has been found in the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments in Split, and from it it is obvious that this is not a type-X sword, but maybe rather type H.⁷⁸ Thus it would fall within the usual context of the earlier Carolingian period, just like the former two swords from Koljani. Recently, though, I found an interesting photo-

80 Petersen 1919, 126; Androshchuk 2014, 69–71. Usp., primjerice, mač toga tipa iz groba 425 s lokaliteta Mikulčice-Valy u Košta, Hošek 2014, 111–123, 248–249.

81 Geibig 1991, 48–50.

82 Petrinc 2009, 80.

83 Milošević 2000a, 271–272, IV. 153–154.

84 Jurčević 2009, 67–68. Jedna je grobnica pronađena ispred vjerojatnog westwerka, a druga unutar njega, no najvjerojatnije se radi o istoj situaciji kao na Crkvi u Biskupiji, gdje zidane grobnice prethode gradnji crkve.

85 Jurčević 2009.

86 Belošević 2007, 132–134, T. LXXIII: 1–8.

87 Belošević 2010, 51, T. XXXIII: 1–4.

73 For example, it occurs on a silver liturgical spatula with a gilt spoon-ending from Mainz, 8th/9th century, on which four such symbols are placed around a central cross (Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009, 190–191, Fig. 31); likewise, on a silver bow-brooch with equal arms from Camon, dépt. Somme, France, 9th century, which of course is not a liturgical object but also has four such symbols placed around a central cross motif on either of the arms (*Ibid.*, 178, 181, Fig. 23/1). A matching symbol, only more elongated, is found on the upper side of the Haithabu Bb sword's crossguard. Taking into account the totality of Christian symbolics on its hilt, Wamers (1994, 13) proposed a possible interpretation of this symbol precisely as a symbol of the Trinity.

74 To give just a few of the otherwise numerous examples: two sides of a baptistery ciborium from the Pula cathedral and the side of an altar ciborium from the church of St Felicitas in the same city's suburbs, 9th century (Milošević 2000a, 62–63, I. 51–52); an altar screen pluteus from the Krk cathedral, 8th/9th century (*Ibid.*, 126, III. 8c); a side of a ciborium from the church of St Chrysogonus in Zadar, 9th century (*Ibid.*, 166, III. 53).

75 Milošević 2012a, 461–463.

76 Although Ante Milošević did publish three separate articles focused on this sword, they are practically identical texts (Milošević 2012a; 2016a; 2016b), in which there is unfortunately no basic information about the dimensions of the sword or belt tongue. The author also interprets the Slankovac sword as a product of Scandinavian workshops, with which it is difficult to agree. For detailed argumentation of its Carolingian provenance see Bilogrivić 2018a, esp. 90–94.

77 Jelovina 1976, 116–117, 140, n. 173a; Vinski 1983, 12, Pl. III: 1.

78 The seemingly triangular pommel points to such a possibility. However, the longer sides of the crossguard and the pommel actually seem fairly straight and not curved, as would be expected in a type-H hilt. See also Milošević 2012a, 460, 462; 2016a, 244–245; 2016b, 210–211; Bilogrivić 2013, 77–78.

dena je bez garniture, izuzev jedne kopče (T. 6: 1).⁸⁸ Svih pet navedenih ostruga ističu se masivnošću, što ih razlikuje od tipološki inače vrlo sličnog para iz groba 1 s Vukovića mosta. Potonje također djeluju kvalitetnije izradene, što je vidljivo u izvedbi kopči na krajevima krakova. U ostalim grobovima s ostrugama nalaze se međusobno gotovo identični primjerci (grobovi 166, 167 i 322) s po šest zakovica na četvrtastim pločicama na krajevima krakova, osim ostruga iz groba 312, koje završavaju polukružnim pločicama s po jednom zakovicom (T. 7; T. 8: 1, 3).⁸⁹ Garniture navedenih ostruga mahom sadrže jezičice oblika slova „U“ i petlje s ovalnom pločicom (uključujući ostruge iz groba 161). Od karolinškog oružja u navedenim grobovima pronađen je jedino mač blizak tipu H u trojnom grobu 322 (bez elemenata remena za nošenje) te uz njega jedno koplje, dok su u ostalima, kao prilozi oružja, nađeni jedino vrhovi strelica.

Osim navedene komparativne jednostavnosti i skromnosti ždrijačkih nalaza, primjetne su još neke razlike, poput vrlo jednostavnih, mahom ovalnih, željeznih kopči ostružnih garnitura iz grobova 74, 167 i 312, naspram uobičajenim narebrenima. Također, upadljiva je i činjenica da je ostruga u grobu 74 pojedinačni primjerak unatoč tomu što se radi o ukupu dvojice muškaraca. Sveukupni dojam, s iznimkom ostruga iz groba 161, na prvi pogled ukazuje na mogućnost da je većina ovih nalaza možda doista rezultat trgovine. U svakom slučaju, izostanak raskošnijih, pa čak i jednostavnih brončanih primjeraka upućivao bi na zaključak o mogućem nešto nižem rangu ili razini moći ždrijačkih pokojnika u odnosu na one iz Biskupije ili Gornjih Koljana. Nasuprot tomu, nalazi staklene boce i čaša u grobovima 322 i 310 govore o nesumnjivo visokom statusu i društvenom položaju pokojnika u njima pa je prisutnost „prosječnijih“ nalaza karolinškog oružja i ostruga svakako zanimljiva i zahtijeva drugačije objašnjenje.⁹⁰

Uz same nalaze, važne podatke otkriva i kontekst te prostorni raspored navedenih grobova, odnosno njihov odnos prema drugim grobovima.⁹¹ Grobovi 161, 166 i 167 nalaze se na zapadnom

graph in the Archives of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb,⁷⁹ showing two swords from Koljani – one is the aforementioned type K from Vukovića Most, while the other would, according to Z. Vinski's note on the back of the photograph, be precisely the sword presented to H. Selassie. As it seems, this is also the photograph based on which the drawing for Vinski's 1983 publication was created. In any case, the latter sword is not a type X, nor is it a type H. As far as can be deduced from the photograph, its pommel is two-part and at first glance looks more like Petersen's type N,⁸⁰ i.e. Geibig's combination type 8,⁸¹ although the very slight possibility that it might be a type K with a severely corroded pommel crown can not also be completely ruled out. The question of whether the two photographs are even of the same sword also arises here, of course. Reaching a definitive conclusion is impossible without a hands-on inspection of the "Ethiopian" example.

In any case, certainly later than the graves with swords are the graves at Crkvina in Gornji Koljani, in which only spurs have been found. Unfortunately, practically no documentation about them exists from the time of the excavation at the end of the 19th century, so information about the exact context of the finds is unknown.⁸² Among a number of examples from this site, two pairs of robust bronze spurs stand out (Pl. 9: 4), their branches ending with rectangular plates with eight rivets, and morphologically analogous to those from the sarcophagus of Crkvina in Biskupija, but with much simpler decoration (incised triangles at the base of the thorn).⁸³ Strap sets consist of U-shaped tongues and loops with an oval plate similar to those already described from the grave at Vukovića Most, with the difference that these tongues are not tapered towards the tip. In accordance with the analogous graves in Biskupija it is possible to presume that, beside the spurs, there were no other goods in these graves and date them approximately to the time of the sarcophagus grave at Crkvina in Biskupija. So, viewing the sites in Koljani as a whole, great similarities with Biskupija are apparent. There is the first phase of graves with swords, followed by graves with spurs only, while by the church at Crkvina in Gornji Koljani vaulted tombs were also found, probably similar to those from Biskupija.⁸⁴ Finally there are great similarities between both churches, not only in their layout but also in interior decoration, i.e. the church furniture.⁸⁵

In the light of these sites it is possible to interpret other cemeteries as well, for instance the one at Ždrijac, in Nin, where

88 Belošević 2007, 78, T. LVII: 10.

89 Isto, 138–140, 220–222, 228, T. LXXV: 15–18, T. LXVI: 1–8, T. C: 1–8, T. CII: 3–10. Na bazama trnova ostruga iz grobova 166 i 322 sačuvali su se tragovi brončanog lima pa nije isključeno da je takav ukras bio prisutan i na ostalima. Usp. Petrinec 2009, 175.

90 O staklenim čašama i boci sa Ždrijaca v. detaljnije u Perović 2010. Zanimljive je rezultate dala i antropološka analiza kostura pokojnika iz spomenutoga groba 312, pokopanog s karolinškim ostrugama i u prvome redu do onoga u kojemu se nalaze najbogatiji grobovi na cijelome lokalitetu, upravo 310 i 322. Komparacijom bioloških karakteristika sa 22 druga muška pokojnika s istoga lokaliteta, a koji se prema prilogama svrstavaju u niži društveni sloj, pokazano je kako su uvjeti života cjelokupne populacije uglavnom bili bez posebnih razlika, odnosno da su pripadnici i višeg i nižih društvenih slojeva bili izloženi jednakim životnim uvjetima te vjerojatno imali jednaku ili sličnu prehranu. Pokojnik iz groba 312 uklopio se u opću sliku komparativnog uzorka (Šlaus, Vyrroubal, Bedić 2010, 25–35). Autori ističu mogućnost da se pripadnost višem staležu nije stjecala isključivo rođenjem, nego uvjetno rečeno zaslugama (isto, 32). Takva se pretpostavka uklapa u značajke pretpostavljenog tadašnjega društvenog uređenja s uglednicima (*big-men*) na čelu, odnosno prijelazne faze prema poglavštvu (*chiefdom*).

91 Na Ždrijacu se nalaze dva odvojena groblja 8. i prve polovine 9. stoljeća, zapadno i istočno, među kojima, prema nalazima iz grobova, velikim dijelom nema osobitih kronoloških razlika, a zanimljivo je da se u oba slučaja prilogama najbogatiji grobovi nalaze u zapadnom dijelu groblja, dok je u istočnom (odnosno jugoistočnom na zapadnom groblju) skupina grobova s vrlo rijetkim prilozi-

79 AAMZ 210–4. The photograph will be published, together with a more detailed consideration of this case, in the proceedings of a conference dedicated to the life and professional work of Z. Vinski: Bilogrivić 2019b.

80 Petersen 1919, 126; Androshchuk 2014, 69–71. Cf., for example, a sword of the same type from grave 425 in Mikulčice-Valy, in Košta, Hošek 2014, 111–123, 248–249.

81 Geibig 1991, 48–50.

82 Petrinec 2009, 80.

83 Milošević 2000a, 271–272, IV. 153–154.

84 Jurčević 2009, 67–68. One of the tombs was found in front of the probable westwork, and the other within it, but most probably this is the same situation as at Crkvina in Biskupija, where such tombs precede the construction of the church.

85 Jurčević 2009.

groblju, svi u istome redu, i dobar su pokazatelj već spomenutog ulaska novih elemenata (karolinške ratničke opreme) u ustaljeni grobni ritus, primjetan i u okolnim grobovima.⁹² Slična je situacija i na istočnome groblju, gdje se nalaze grobovi 74, 312 i 322. Kao prvo, grobovi s keramičkim posudama koncentrirani su u dvije skupine, jednoj oko groba 74 i drugoj uz grob 322, dok su ostali uobičajeni prilozi, poput noževa i kresiva, uglavnom ravnomjerno raspoređeni te je općenito vidljivo prakticiranje grobnog ritusa tipičnog za horizont s poganskim značajkama pokapanja. Nakit se pak nalazi gotovo isključivo u redu kojem pripada i grob 322, prilozi najbogatiji na Ždrijacu, kao i u njemu susjednim grobovima.⁹³ U toj se skupini grobova neosporno odražava visok status i bogatstvo pokojnika, no za temu ovoga rada zanimljive su i sljedeće pojedinosti. U istom redu s grobom 322 nalaze se grobovi 311 i 323 s keramičkim posudama i noževima, kao i grob 310, u kojemu su uz staklenu čašu, analognu onoj iz groba 322, pronađena i dva noža te jedna strelica.⁹⁴ Dakle, uobičajeni prilozi horizonta s poganskim značajkama pokapanja. Međutim, grobu 322 sa zapadne su i istočne strane susjedni grobovi 326 i 324, u kojima su pronađeni, između ostaloga, prilozi s jasnim kršćanskim simbolima. U grobu 326 dva srebrna prstena, od kojih jedan s motivom križa, a drugi s motivom pentagrama, te u grobu 324 jedan srebrni prsten s motivom pentagrama i pozlaćena brončana križna aplika s antropomorfnim maskama na krajevima krakova (T. 8: 2).⁹⁵ Zanimljivo je da se u grobu 324 nalazila i kalotasta brončana ukrasna aplika, kakva je, gotovo identična, pronađena i u grobu 322.⁹⁶ Obje su se nalazile na pojasu djeteta. Pokojnica u grobu 326 bila je pokopana u drvenom lijesu, kao i pokojnici iz groba 322. Keramičkih posuda u grobovima 326 i 324 nije bilo. Ovi grobovi, kao i u biskupijskom slučaju, upućuju na oprez pri jednoznačnom određivanju pokojnika kao kršćana ili pogana samo na temelju prisutnosti određenih priloga u grobovima, premda su s obzirom na položaj vjerojatno nešto mlađi od groba 322.

ma ili bez priloga uopće. Također, valja napomenuti da je zapadno groblje istraženo gotovo u cijelosti, a istočno tek djelomično i očito se širilo dalje prema jugu, što sugerira nalaz groba 320 u sondi D. Usp. Belošević 2007, 13–15 i Prilog 1. Prema novoj analizi Ždrijackih grobalja u Alajbeg 2015, na zapadnome je groblju određena veća skupina grobova koji se mogu datirati prije sredine 8. stoljeća, kakvih na istočnome groblju nema. To bi upućivalo na zaključak kako kronološke razlike ipak postoje, odnosno da se istočno groblje, kao zasebno, izdvaja upravo u vrijeme trajanja horizonta Biskupija-Crkvina. Međutim, kako se ono širilo prema neistraženom južnom, možda i jugoistočnom području, ne može se sasvim isključiti mogućnost da je i ondje postojala ranija faza.

92 V. Bilogrivić 2014.

93 Belošević 2007, Prilog 2–4.

94 Isto, 218–220.

95 Isto, 232–238.

96 Prema Petrinec 2009, 147–148; 2010a, 197–198, križić, tj. križna aplika, može se povezati s križnim fibulama u plemićkim grobovima ranokarolinškog vremena u sjeverozapadnoj Europi, a njegov ukras pak sa stilom Blatnica. I kalotaste aplikе autorica pripisuje istome horizontu i datira ih na kraj 8. i početak 9. stoljeća. Nedavno je Zbigniew Robak (2017) temeljitom kritičkom analizom pokazao neodrživost koncepta horizonta / stila Blatnica-Mikulčice, kao i da mnoge nalaze, koji su mu se pripisivali, zapravo treba datirati u središnju trećinu 9. stoljeća pa i kasnije. Datacija ovdje razmatranih aplikа, međutim, ne mijenja se u tome smislu (usp. primjerice Robakovu (2017, 111–112) interpretaciju dvaju kalotastih aplikа pripisivanih nalazu iz Blatnice, koje postavlja u kasnoavarski horizont i datira od 750. do 800./825., s većom vjerojatnošću pripadnosti kasnijem dijelu toga raspona). Drugačije tumačenje križne aplikе, povezano sa starim slavenskim vjerovanjima, nudi Milošević 2012b; 2013, 90–133. Autor također smatra kako je izvorno služila kao element konjske orme, jednako kao i kalotaste aplikе, te da se u grobu nalaze u sekundarnoj upotrebi.

Carolingian finds often come from the richest graves of the cemetery, but are much simpler and more modest than those from Biskupija and Gornji Koljani. The spurs are typologically analogous to those discussed above, but were made of iron and mostly undecorated. Those from grave 161 stand out, with brass foil around the base of the thorn decorated with incised triangles, ribbed buckles at the ends of branches and bird-shaped tongues of strap sets (Pl. 6: 2).⁸⁶ The closest analogy are the spurs from grave 52 in the cemetery of Kašić-Maklinovo Brdo,⁸⁷ and from Ždrijac the morphologically almost identical spur from the double inhumation grave 74, although lacking the brass foil around the thorn. This spur was also the only one in the grave and was found with no elements of a strap set, aside from one buckle (Pl. 6: 1).⁸⁸ All five of these spurs are conspicuous for their robustness, which also sets them apart from the otherwise typologically very similar pair from grave 1 at Vukovića Most. The latter ones also give an impression of higher production quality, visible in the execution of the buckles at the ends of the branches. In the other graves with spurs, mutually almost identical examples were found (graves 166, 167 and 322), with six rivets on the rectangular plates at the ends of the branches, except for the spurs from grave 312, which end with semicircular plates with one rivet each (Pl. 7; Pl. 8: 1, 3).⁸⁹ The straps of these spurs regularly have U-shaped tongues and loops with an oval plate (including those from grave 161). Only one piece of Carolingian weaponry was found in these graves – a sword close to type H in the triple inhumation grave 322 (with no elements of a sword belt) and with it one spear – while in the other graves only arrowheads were found.

Besides the above-mentioned comparative simplicity and modesty of the finds from Ždrijac, some other differences are noticeable, such as the very simple, regularly oval, iron buckles of spur strap sets from graves 74, 167 and 312 opposite the usual ribbed ones. Furthermore, the fact that the spur from grave 74 is a single find, in spite of this being a burial of two men, is conspicuous. The total impression, with the exception of the spurs from grave 161, indicates the possibility that most of these finds perhaps really were the result of trade. In any case, the absence of more lavish pieces, or even the simple bronze ones, could point to a conclusion about a slightly lower rank or level of power of the deceased of Ždrijac in comparison with those of Biskupija or Gornji Koljani. Contrary to that, finds of a glass bottle and two glass goblets in graves 322 and 310 testify to the undoubtedly high status and social standing of the deceased buried in them. The presence of 'more average' finds of Carolingian weaponry and spurs is thus certainly interesting and demands a different explanation.⁹⁰

86 Belošević 2007, 132–134, Pl. LXXIII: 1–8.

87 Belošević 2010, 51, Pl. XXXIII: 1–4.

88 Belošević 2007, 78, Pl. LVII: 10.

89 *Ibid.*, 138–140, 220–222, 228, Pl. LXXV: 15–18, Pl. LXVI: 1–8, Pl. C: 1–8, Pl. CII: 3–10. At the bases of the thorns of spurs from graves 166 and 322, traces of bronze foil have been preserved, so the possibility of the same kind of decoration on the other examples can not be ruled out. Cf. Petrinec 2009, 175.

90 For more details on the glass vessels from Ždrijac, see Perović 2010. Interesting results were also reached by the anthropological analysis of the skeleton of the deceased from the above-mentioned grave 312, buried with Carolingian spurs and in the first row next to that in which the richest graves of the

Veliko groblje na Begovači u Biljanima Donjim, koje se razvija oko predromaničke crkvice i traje od 9. pa sve do u 17. stoljeće, pokazuje pak drugačije, nešto kasnije okolnosti. Naime, ovdje su u samo dva groba, 253 i 258, pronađene karolinške ostruge (T. 9: 2–3). U oba se slučaja radi o jednostavnim željeznim primjercima, od kojih prvi par na završecima krakova ima narebrenne kopče nalik ostrugama s Vukovića mosta u Gornjim Koljanima, dok druge imaju pravokutne pločice s po šest zakovica i srodne su većini ždrijačkih nalaza. Ostružna garnitura iz groba 253 sastoji se od narebrenih brončanih petlji, narebrenih četvrtastih brončanih kopči i željeznog jezičca oblika slova „U“. One iz groba 258 imaju željezne petlje s ovalnom pločicom i analogni jezičac te jednostavne ovalne željezne kopče.⁹⁷ Unatoč sličnosti ovih nalaza s onima iz Nina, smatram kako zbog konteksta ove grobove treba datirati nešto kasnije, otprilike u vrijeme nedugo nakon groba u sarkofagu s hipokampima iz Biskupije. Naime, groblje na Begovači razvija se većinom od sredine 9. stoljeća,⁹⁸ dok su tek rijetki grobovi, među kojima upravo 253 i 258, raniji, ali ne znatno. U njima nedostaju drugi prilozi (samo dva nožića i prapovijesni artefakti u funkciji kremenja i kresiva u grobu 258),⁹⁹ no najvažnije je da su oba groba izrađena od masivnih antičkih spolija (T. 9: 1) i nalaze se unutar apsidalnog dijela ostataka ranijeg (kasno) antičkog objekta,¹⁰⁰ čime dobivaju posebno istaknuto mjesto na lokalitetu gdje će se ubrzo početi razvijati veliko groblje.

Nije neosnovano pretpostaviti da se možda radi o namjernom nastojanju imitiranja izgleda sarkofaga, moguće s izravnim reminiscencijama na spomenuti grob ispod *westwerka* iz Biskupije, odnosno barem približavanja njegovu obliku u nemogućnosti pribavljanja ili izrade pravoga sarkofaga.¹⁰¹ Dodatnu su važnost ovi grobovi dobivali i mjestom ukopa, gdje je grob 258 čak bio precizno postavljen u vrhu apside, čiji luk dodiruje s unutarnje strane, pa se ponekad pretpostavlja da se možda radi o samome osnivaču predromaničke crkvice.¹⁰² Moguće je, međutim, i da su

Along with the finds themselves, important information comes from the context and spatial arrangement of the graves discussed, i.e. their relation to other graves.⁹¹ Graves 161, 166 and 167 are located in the western cemetery, all in the same row, and are a good indicator of the already mentioned penetration of new elements (Carolingian warrior equipment) into the usual burial rite, evident also in the surrounding graves.⁹² A similar situation is likewise present in the eastern cemetery, where graves 74, 312 and 322 are located. First of all, graves with clay pots are concentrated in two groups – one around grave 74, the other near grave 322 – while the other usual grave goods, like knives and flint steels, are mostly evenly distributed, and the practice of the burial rite typical of the horizon with pagan burial characteristics is generally visible. Jewellery, though, is found almost exclusively in the row in which grave 322, the richest in grave goods at Ždrijac, is located, as well as in the graves adjacent to it.⁹³ In this group of graves, high status and wealth of the deceased are unquestionably reflected, but for the topic of this paper the following details are also interesting. In the same row as grave 322 are graves 311 and 323, with clay pots and knives, as well as grave 310, in which two knives and one arrowhead were found, along with a glass goblet analogous to the one from grave 322.⁹⁴ The usual finds of the horizon with pagan burial characteristics. However, adjacent to grave 322 on its west and east sides are graves 326 and 324, respectively, in which objects with obvious Christian symbols were found among other grave goods. In grave 326 two silver rings, one bearing a cross motif, the other a pentagram, and in grave 324 one silver ring with a pentagram motif and a gilt bronze cross appliqué with anthropomorphic masks at the ends of the bars (Pl. 8: 2).⁹⁵ Interesting to note is the find of a small

97 Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981, 83–84, 107–108; Petrinc 2009, 62.

98 Petrinc 2009, 275. V. također Sokol 2006, 72–74. Sasvim drugačije tumačenje ovoga groblja (pa onda i drugih) donosi Jakšić 1989, osobito 409–410, 422–423, 432, gdje se samo rijetki grobovi datiraju u 9. i 10., a većina tek od kraja 11. stoljeća. Takvo tumačenje, međutim, nije općeprihvaćeno.

99 U grobu 258 nalazio se i kostur ženske osobe, također *in situ*, bez ikakvih priloga ili nalaza. Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981, 69, 84.

100 Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981, 69 i sl. 28. U novijoj je literaturi prevladavajući stav kako se radi o rimskom objektu, kasnije pretvorenom u ranokršćansku crkvu, dok su istraživači ovog lokaliteta smatrali da stariji zidovi predstavljaju isključivo ostatke profane arhitekture. Pojedini autori također misle kako je ovaj objekt korišten i kao crkva većih gabarita u predromani, kada bi bio opremljen novim namještajem, dok većina ipak drži kako je tada na njegovim temeljima sagrađena manja predromanička crkva. Grobovi 253 i 258, čini se, idu u prilog potonjoj tezi. Usp. različita mišljenja u Jakšić 1989, 421; Jelovina 1990, 95–96, 100; Jurković 2000, 173, 185; Milošević 2000a, 190–191, IV, 15; Petrinc 2009, 62. Posljednji pregled današnje diskusije uz nove zaključke donosi Josipović 2012, 131–134, 139–146.

101 Na Begovači je pronađen i pravi sarkofag, jednostavan i neukrašen (grob 165), no bez karolinških nalaza. U njemu su pronađene kosti muškarca, skupljene na hrpi u sredini sarkofaga, a među njima fragmenti triju željeznih noževa. Ovaj se grob nalazio nešto dalje od predromaničke crkve i apside ranijeg objekta, u smjeru sjevera, i vjerojatno je i nešto kasniji od grobova 253 i 258. Usp. Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981, 68, sl. 27 i plan groblja.

102 Usp. Jakšić 1989, 423, koji, međutim, smatra da je riječ o obnovitelju ranokršćanske crkve u predromaničkom razdoblju, pokopanom, dakle, u svetištu funkcionirajuće crkve. Također, Jakšić ovaj grob izričito naziva sarkofagom. Isto tako, kao ukop obnovitelja i donatora crkve te njegove obitelji unutar svetišta grobove 253 i 258 tumači i Josipović 2012, 144–145.

whole site were located, precisely graves 310 and 322. Comparison of its biological characteristics with 22 other male skeletons from the same site, which are, in accordance with their grave goods, attributed to the lower social level, has shown that the living conditions of the entire population were mostly without special differences, i.e. that members of both higher as well as lower social levels were exposed to equal living conditions and probably had equal or similar diet. The deceased from grave 312 fits into the general picture of the comparative material. Šlaus, Vyroubal, Bedić 2010, 25–35. The authors stress the possibility that belonging to a higher level of society was attained not exclusively by birth, but by merit, so to speak (*Ibid.*, 32). Such an assumption fits well within the characteristics of the presumed social structure of the time, with *big-men* as leaders, i.e. the transitional phase into *chiefdom*.

91 There were two separate cemeteries of the 8th century and the first half of the 9th at Ždrijac, a western one and an eastern one, between which there are no important chronological differences according to the grave goods. It is interesting that, in both cases, the graves richest in goods are located in the western parts of the cemeteries, while in the eastern (southeastern in the western cemetery) there is a group of graves with only rare grave goods or none at all. It should also be stated that the western cemetery was excavated almost entirely, but the eastern only partly, and it obviously extended further to the south, suggested by the find of grave 320 in trench D. Cf. Belošević 2007, 13–15 and Plan 1. According to the recent analysis of the Ždrijac graves in Alajbeg 2015, a larger group of graves that can be dated before the middle of the 8th century can be defined, while such graves are not present in the eastern cemetery. This would point to a conclusion that chronological differences do exist, i.e. that the separate eastern cemetery began precisely in the time of the Biskupija-Crkvina horizon. However, since it spread further towards the unexcavated southern, may be also southeastern, area, the existence of an earlier phase in that part, too, can not be completely excluded.

92 See Bilogrivić 2014.

93 Belošević 2007, Plans 2–4.

94 *Ibid.*, 218–220.

95 *Ibid.*, 232–238.

ovi grobovi bili nešto raniji od te crkve, ukopani prije nego što je ona sagrađena ili možda upravo u vrijeme njezine gradnje, pa su se iz tog razloga nalazili unutar apside starijeg objekta, a ne uz samu predromaničku crkvu ili unutar nje.¹⁰³ U svakom slučaju, položaj u apsidi (kasno)antičkoga objekta ukazuje na monumentalizaciju groba prema karolinškom obrascu.¹⁰⁴

Ranosrednjovjekovni ukopi u sarkofazima javljaju se u zaleđu istočne jadranske obale tijekom prve polovine 9. stoljeća, što se može tumačiti kao izravan odraz karolinške renesanse i emuliranja ovoga istaknutog načina pokapanja od strane lokalne elite, prije negoli kao utjecaj kasnoantičkih tradicija lokalnog stanovništva.¹⁰⁵ U antičkom sarkofagu dopremljenom iz Rima pokopan je bio i Karlo Veliki (ispod zapadnog ulaza crkve u Aachenu), a zatim i neki od njegovih nasljednika poput Ludovika Pobožnog i kasnijih careva,¹⁰⁶ te je upravo prema tom uzoru mogao nastati i biskupijski sarkofag,¹⁰⁷ a zatim i drugi istovrsni i slični grobovi. Prema nekim autorima, ista radionica koja je izradila sarkofag s Crkvine u Biskupiji bila bi zaslužna i za sarkofag pronađen uz crkvu sv. Bartula na Crkvini u Galovcu (T. 4: 2), također izrađen od komada rimske arhitekture. Pretpostavlja se da ih je izradila radionica *Majstora koljanskog pluteja*, koja je zaslužna i za oltarne ograde i drugi namještaj u obje crkve, kao i u crkvi u Gornjim Koljanima. U ukrašenom sarkofagu iz Galovca uz pokojnika, doduše, nisu pronađeni nikakvi nalazi, no po svemu seradio istom vremenom i istom duhu kao i u biskupijskom slučaju.¹⁰⁸

103 Kao potencijalno analogna situacija mogao bi se navesti lokalitet Rešetarica kod Livna, gdje su otkriveni temeljni ostaci ranokršćanske crkve s prigradenim prostorijama. Crkva je bila u funkciji najkasnije do početka 7. stoljeća, a zatim ranosrednjovjekovnom razdoblju iznad i unutar njenih ostataka slijedi ukapanje. Otkriveno je svega 8 grobova, od kojih su potpuno istražena tek dva. Među njima je najzanimljiviji ranije navedeni grob 4 s karolinškim nakćem tipa K i ostrugama, a koji je ukopan tik uz temelje južnog ramena apside nekadašnje crkve, s njezine vanjske strane. Ukop je ovoga groba očito respektirao ostatke arhitekture (za razliku od grobova 3 i 5), a izbor mjesta ukapanja na lokaciji nekadašnje crkve, pogotovo uz apsidu, nikako nije mogao biti slučajna. Za opis i lokaciju groba v. Vrdoljak 1988, 184 i plan lokaliteta.

104 Milošević 2000a, 191, IV. 15.

105 Usp. Jurčević 2011, 130–133. Za tumačenje franačkih utjecaja u smislu barem dijelom svjesnih nastojanja emulacije franačkih modela društvenog života (u što spada i pogreb) od strane lokalne elite v. Ančić 2005, 225; 2016, 237.

106 Nelson 2000, 145–153, 155–160, 162–163, 167–168; Budak 2001, 106–107; Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009, 156–157.

107 Vrlo istaknuti društveni položaj pokojnika iz ovoga sarkofaga, osim samoga mjesta i spominjanih pozlaćenih brončanih ostruga, pokazivala je i odjeća, navodno od svile, koja je bila dijelom sačuvana pri otvaranju sarkofaga, ali i danas izgubljeni zlatom optočeni privjesak od jaspisa ili gorskog kristala (Radić 1896, 75, 84–85; Petrinec 2009, 69). Naime, drago kamenje se, kao pokazatelj zemaljske moći, u karolinškom svijetu koristilo za ukrašavanje predmeta kraljeva i careva, eventualno i pripadnika najviših slojeva plemstva i klera (Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009, 160–161, 167–168). Da su raskošni privjesci bili vladarski znamen, upozoreno je u hrvatskoj mediévističkoj literaturi već u Milošević, Peković 2009, 240–241.

108 Više o sarkofagu iz Galovca u Belošević 1996; Jakšić 2000, 205; Jurčević 2011, 136–137.

hemispherical bronze decorative appliqué in grave 324, almost identical to the one found in grave 322.⁹⁶ Both were located on the waists of children. The deceased woman in grave 326 was interred in a wooden coffin, just like the individuals in grave 322. There were no clay pots in graves 326 and 324. Just as in the case of Biskupija, these graves suggest necessary caution with one-sided determination of a deceased as being Christian or pagan only on the basis of the presence of certain objects in the grave, although judging from their position they are probably slightly later than grave 322.

The large cemetery at Begovača in Biljane Donje, which originated around a small pre-Romanesque church and lasted from the 9th century right through to the 17th, displays different, slightly later circumstances. Carolingian spurs were here found only in two graves, namely 253 and 258 (Pl. 9: 2–3). In both cases they are simple iron pieces, with the branches of the first pair ending with ribbed buckles similar to those from Vukovića Most in Gornji Koljani, while the latter have rectangular plates with six rivets and are similar to most of the finds from Ždrijac. The spur strap set from grave 253 consists of ribbed bronze loops, ribbed rectangular bronze buckles and an iron U-shaped tongue. Those from grave 258 have iron loops with oval plates and an analogous tongue, along with simple oval iron buckles.⁹⁷ In spite of the similarity of these finds to those from Nin, I argue that these graves should be dated somewhat later on account of their context, and approximately to the time not long after the grave in the sarcophagus with hippocampi in Biskupija. The Begovača cemetery originated for the most part from the middle of the 9th century,⁹⁸ with only rare graves of just a slightly earlier date, among which are numbers 253 and 258. They lack other grave goods (only two knives and prehistoric artefacts with the function of flint and steel in grave 258),⁹⁹ but the most important fact is that both of the graves were made from massive antique Roman spolia (Pl. 9: 1) and located within the apse of the earlier (Late) Roman build-

96 According to Petrinec 2009, 147–148; 2010a, 197–198, the cross, i.e. the cross-shaped appliqué, can be connected with cross-shaped brooches from Early Carolingian graves in northwestern Europe and its decoration with the Blatnica style. The author also ascribes the hemispherical appliqué to the same horizon and dates them to the end of the 8th century or the very beginning of the 9th. In a thorough critical analysis (Robak 2017), Zbigniew Robak has recently shown the untenability of the whole concept of the Blatnica-Mikučice horizon/style, as well as that many of the finds previously ascribed to it should actually be dated to the central third of the 9th century and even later. The dating of the appliqué discussed here does not change in that sense, however (cf., for example, Robak's interpretation of two hemispherical appliqué usually attributed to the Blatnica find, which he sets within the Late Avar horizon and dates between 750 and 800/825, with greater probability towards the latter part of that range. Robak 2017, 111–112). A different interpretation of the cross-shaped appliqué, connected with Old Slavic beliefs, is presented in Milošević 2012b; 2013, 90–133. The author is also of the opinion that it had originally been part of a horse headgear, as had also the hemispherical ones, and that they were placed in these graves in secondary use.

97 Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981, 83–84, 107–108; Petrinec 2009, 62.

98 Petrinec 2009, 275. See also Sokol 2006, 72–74. A completely different interpretation of this cemetery (and then also others) is presented in Jakšić 1989, esp. 409–410, 422–423, 432, where only rare graves are dated to the 9th and 10th centuries, the majority only from the end of the 11th. Such an interpretation has not been generally accepted.

99 Grave 258 also contained a skeleton of a female individual, likewise *in situ*, with no grave goods or finds. Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981, 69, 84.

Zaključak

Zaključno bih istaknuo da, ako se o već dobro poznatim nalazima postave nova pitanja i promotri ih se iz drugačije perspektive, može se proširiti spoznaja o njima dalje od problematike podrijetla i generalnog utjecaja, ili barem ponuditi drugačiji zaključci. U tome smislu nalazi karolinškog oružja i ratničke opreme s područja današnje Hrvatske te Bosne i Hercegovine ključni su izvor za proučavanje konstrukcije identiteta lokalne elite, koji se razvija od najranijih kontakata s Francima u posljednjoj četvrtini 8. stoljeća, a izrazitije tijekom prve polovine devetoga. On nastaje u izravnoj vezi s njima, no uvijek nesigurna pozicija ranosrednjovjekovnih vladara zahtijevala je i njegovu demonstraciju ostalim pripadnicima elite i podređenima, vlastitome „narodu“, te se upravo kao rezultat toga međuodnosa identitet u tragovima manifestira u arheološkome materijalu. Nastavljanje je starih tradicija najvidljivije u prvoj fazi, uz isticanje karolinškog oružja u grobovima. Uskoro nestaje većina priloga, pogotovo keramičke posude, i ostaju samo ostruge kao oznaka moći i identiteta, a zatim se pojavljuje i nekoliko posebno istaknutih grobova u sarkofazima. Valja naglasiti da ni elita, pogotovo u ranom stadiju formiranja, nije homogena i da je zapravo njezin najviši, vladarski dio onaj koji diktira smjer razvoja identiteta. Očito je to u usporedbi grobova s Crkvine u Biskupiji i ostalih istovremenih groblja. S jedne strane, možemo primijetiti da je na njima prisutno određeno imitiranje, odnosno emuliranje načina pokapanja biskupijskih pripadnika elite. Grobovi iz Biskupije mogu se, prema tomu, tumačiti kao primjer promjena u prakticiranju identiteta kroz grobni ritus, koji je valjalo slijediti kako bi se pokazala pripadnost novoj eliti. Slučaj lokaliteta Nin-Ždrijac, gdje su prisutni većinom jednostavniji i skromniji karolinški nalazi, može se stoga tumačiti i drugačije od trgovine. Budući da je velik dio tamošnjih ostruga međusobno gotovo identičan, može se pomišljati i na to da ih je vrh lokalne elite darovao svojim podložnicima. S druge strane, stakleni prilozima u ždrijačkim grobovima ukazuju na gotovo jednako visok status pokojnika pa je možda riječ o njihovom kasnijem uzdizanju u društvenoj hijerarhiji, zajedno s počecima uspona Nina kao važnoga franačkoga crkvenog središta.

Osim unutarnje strukture hijerarhije, postojali su svakako i mnogi drugi razlozi koji su uvjetovali prisutnost ili odsutnost pojedinih priloga u grobovima, kao i razlike u kvaliteti među istovrsnim prilozima. Ukazano je ranije da u kasnom 8. i ranijem 9. stoljeću treba računati i dalje s više različitih skupina unutar šireg pojma lokalne elite. Tako su ostali pripadnici elite mogli i trebali slijediti „vladarski“ predložak, ali nisu uvijek i ne svi, a njihovo se odbijanje prihvaćanja (potpunog) obrasca također moglo pokazivati upotrebom materijalne kulture u određenim situacijama.¹⁰⁹ Uz

109 Usp. Moreland 2010, 47–48.

ing,¹⁰⁰ which gave them an especially distinguished place at the site where a large cemetery would soon start to develop.

It is not unfounded to presume that this may have been a case of intentional endeavour to imitate the appearance of a sarcophagus, possibly with direct reminiscence to the above-mentioned princely grave in Biskupija, or at least coming close to the shape of one when, for some reason, it was not possible to acquire a genuine sarcophagus or have it manufactured.¹⁰¹ Additional importance for these graves was gained by their location of interment, where grave 258 was set precisely in the top end of the apse, the arch of which it touches from the inside, so it is sometimes presumed that this might possibly be the very founder of the pre-Romanesque church.¹⁰² It is possible, on the other hand, that these graves were slightly earlier than the church, interred before it had been built, or maybe just at the time of its construction, and therefore located within the apse of the older building instead of being adjacent to the pre-Romanesque church or inside it.¹⁰³ In any case, the location within the apse of the (Late) Roman building points to the monumentalisation of the grave according to Carolingian patterns.¹⁰⁴

Early medieval burials in sarcophagi appear in the eastern Adriatic hinterland during the first half of the 9th century and can be interpreted as a direct reflection of the Carolingian renaissance and the emulation of this distinguished manner of burial by the local elite rather than an influence of the late antique

100 Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981, 69 and Fig. 28. In recent scholarly literature the prevailing opinion is that this was a Roman object later transformed into an Early Christian church, while the excavators of the site considered the older walls to represent remains of an exclusively profane architecture. Some authors also argue that this object was used as a larger church during the pre-Romanesque period, when it would have been furnished anew, while the majority still holds that a smaller pre-Romanesque church was built over its foundations. Graves 253 and 258 seem to go in favour of the latter thesis. Cf. different viewpoints in: Jakšić 1989, 421; Jelovina 1990, 95–96, 100; Jurković 2000, 173, 185; Milošević 2000a, 190–191, IV. 15; Petrinec 2009, 62. The newest overview of the discussion with new conclusions is brought by Josipović 2012, 131–134, 139–146.

101 A genuine sarcophagus, simple and undecorated, has also been found at Begovača (grave 165), but with no Carolingian finds. Bones of a male individual were found inside it, piled up in the centre of the sarcophagus, and among them fragments of three iron knives. This grave was located a little to the north of the pre-Romanesque church and the apse of the earlier building, and it is probably slightly later than graves 253 and 258. Cf. Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981, 68, Fig. 27 and the plan of the cemetery.

102 Cf. Jakšić 1989, 423, where the deceased is, however, considered to be the renovator of the Early Christian church in the pre-Romanesque period, thus buried in the sanctuary of the functioning church. Furthermore, Jakšić explicitly terms this grave a sarcophagus. Graves 253 and 258 are interpreted in like manner, as burials of the renovator and donor of the church and of his family within the sanctuary, also by Josipović 2012, 144–145.

103 The site of Rešetarica, near Livno, could be cited as a potentially analogous situation, with excavated foundations of an Early Christian church with annexes. The church functioned until the beginning of the 7th century at the latest, with burials ensuing over and inside its remains in the early medieval period. Only 8 graves have been discovered, of which only two were completely excavated. The most interesting among them is the previously mentioned grave 4, with a Carolingian type-K sword and spurs, and buried adjacent to the foundations of the southern shoulder of the apse of the former church, on its outer side. This burial obviously respected the architectural remains (unlike graves 3 and 5), and the selection of the burial spot on the site of a former church, especially by the apse, could not have been accidental. For a description and location of the grave, see Vrdoljak 1988, 184 and the site plan.

104 Milošević 2000a, 191, IV. 15.

nalaze pobliže razmotrene u ovome radu, postoji još čitav niz grobova, često pojedinačnih, s različitim priložima karolinške provenijencije (najčešće ostruga), od kojih se većina uklapa u ovdje predstavljenu generalnu sliku, no pojedini od nje i odstupaju. Takva odstupanja nisu uvijek posljedica kronološke razlike. Mogla su biti i rezultat svjesnog i aktivnog korištenja pojedinih elemenata materijalne kulture u formiranju i prakticiranju identiteta lokalne elite. Unutar takvog prakticiranja identiteta, kao dio cjeline nalaze se i tragovi najranijeg arheološki prepoznatljivog hrvatskog identiteta, koji će tijekom narednih desetljeća prevladati nad ostalima.

traditions of the local inhabitants.¹⁰⁵ Even Charlemagne himself was buried in a Roman sarcophagus brought from Rome (under the west entrance of the church in Aachen) and was followed in this custom by some of his heirs, such as Louis the Pious and later emperors.¹⁰⁶ Precisely this might have been the model for the sarcophagus of Biskupija,¹⁰⁷ followed by other equivalent and similar graves. According to some authors, the same workshop which had made the sarcophagus of Crkvina in Biskupija would also have been responsible for the sarcophagus found by the church of St. Bartholomew at Crkvina in Galovac (Pl. 4: 2), likewise made from a piece of Roman architecture. It is presumed that they were made by the workshop of the *Master of the Koljani pluteus*, responsible also for the altar screens and other furniture in both churches, as well as the church in Gornji Koljani. No grave goods were found inside the decorated sarcophagus of Galovac, though, but all circumstances point to the same time and spirit as in the case of Biskupija.¹⁰⁸

Conclusion

In the end I would like to emphasise that, if new questions are raised about well-known finds, and if they are observed from a different perspective, then the comprehension of them can be expanded further than the questions of origin and general influence, or at least different conclusions can be offered. In that sense the finds of Carolingian weapons and warrior equipment in the territories of present-day Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina are a key source for the study of identity construction of the local elite, beginning with the earliest contacts with the Franks in the last quarter of the 8th century, and more pronouncedly during the first half of the 9th century. This identity was formed in a direct link with the Franks, but the ever-insecure position of early medieval rulers demanded its demonstration towards other members of the elite and the subjects, their own “people”, and exactly as the result of this interrelation it is manifested in traces in archaeological material. The continuation of old traditions is best visible in the first phase, with the emphasis on Carolingian weapons in graves. Most of the grave goods, and especially clay pots, vanish very soon, leaving only spurs as a sign of power and identity, followed by the appearance of a few

105 Cf. Jurčević 2011, 130–133. For an interpretation of Frankish influences in the sense of at least partly conscious endeavours of the local elite to emulate Frankish models of social life (of which funerals also constitute a part) see Ančić 2005, 225; 2016, 237.

106 Nelson 2000, 145–153, 155–160, 162–163, 167–168; Budak 2001, 106–107; Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009, 156–157.

107 Besides the very location and the gilt bronze spurs mentioned above, the very distinguished social position of the deceased from this sarcophagus was displayed also by clothing reportedly made of silk, still partly preserved at the time of the opening of the sarcophagus, as well as the now lost jasper or rock-crystal pendant decorated with filigree golden wire: Radić 1896, 75, 84–85; Petrinec 2009, 69. Precious stones, as indicators of earthly power, were used in the Carolingian world for decoration of the objects of kings and emperors, and only sometimes of the highest levels of the nobility and clergy. Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009, 160–161, 167–168. That luxurious pendants were rulers' attributes has already been stressed in Croatian medievalist literature by Milošević, Peković 2009, 240–241.

108 More details on the sarcophagus of Galovac in Belošević 1996; Jakšić 2000, 205; Jurčević 2011, 136–137.

IZVORI SOURCES

Annales regni Francorum – Annales regni Francorum inde ab a. 741. usque ad a. 829. qui dicuntur Annales Laurissenses Maiores et Einhardi, Kurze, F. (ed.), Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi 6, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1895.

Capitularia regum Francorum – Capitularia regum Francorum, A. Boretius (ed.), Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Capitularia I, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1883.

In honorem Hludowici – Ermoldus Nigellus, In honorem Hludowici, Dümmler, E. (ed.), Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Poetae II, Weidmann, 1884.

Vita Hludowici imperatoris – Astronomus, Vita Hludowici imperatoris, in Tremp, E. (ed. & trans.), *Thegan, Die Taten Kaiser Ludwigs (Gesta Hludowici imperatoris). Astronomus, Die Leben Kaiser Ludwigs (Vita Hludowici imperatoris)*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi 64, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1995.

very distinguished graves in sarcophagi. It must be stressed that the elite itself was not homogeneous, and that its highest, ruling, level was the one actually dictating the direction of the development of this identity. This is clearly visible in comparison of the graves at Crkvina, in Biskupija, with other contemporary cemeteries. On the one hand, we can there notice imitation of sorts, i.e. emulation of the manner of burial of the members of the elite of Biskupija. The graves in Biskupija can therefore be seen as an example of changes in the practice of identity through burial ritual that was to be followed in order to show one's belonging to the new elite. The case of Nin-Ždrijac, where mostly simpler and more modest Carolingian finds are present, can thus be interpreted other than in the sense of trade. Since many of the spurs from the site are mutually almost identical, we might think of them as being gifts from the highest level of the local elite to their subjects. On the other hand, the glass vessels in the graves at Ždrijac point to an almost equally high status of the deceased, so this could also have been the case of their later ascendance in the social hierarchy, together with the beginnings of Nin as an important Frankish ecclesiastical centre.

Besides the inner hierarchy structure there were surely many other reasons which entailed the presence or absence of certain grave goods, just as for the differences in quality of the equivalent objects. In the earlier sections of this paper it was stressed that, in the late 8th century and the early 9th, we should still envisage several different groups within the wider term of local elite. Thus the "ruler's" model could and should have been followed by other members of the elite, but was not always and not by all, and their refusal to accept the (complete) pattern could have been expressed using material culture in certain situations.¹⁰⁹ In addition to the finds more closely discussed in this paper there is a series of other graves, often individual ones, with various grave goods of Carolingian provenance (mostly spurs). Most of them fit into the general picture presented here, while some deviate from it. Such deviations were not always necessarily the consequence of chronological differences. They could also have been the results of conscious and active use of certain elements of material culture in the formation and practice of the local elite's identity. Within such practices of identity, as parts of the whole, lie also the traces of the earliest archaeologically recognisable Croat identity, which in the following decades prevailed over others.

Translation: Goran Bilogrivić

109 Cf. Moreland 2010, 47–48.

BIBLIOGRAFIJA BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alajbeg 2015 – A. Alajbeg, O topografskoj kronologiji ranosrednjovjekovnih grobalja s poganskim osobinama pokapanja u Dalmaciji / On the Topographical Chronology of Early Mediaeval Cemeteries With Pagan Burial Characteristics in Northern Dalmatia, *Archaeologia Adriatica* 9, 2015, 147–168.
- Ančić 2000 – M. Ančić, U osvit novog doba. Karolinško carstvo i njegov jugoistočni obod, in Milošević, A. (ed.), *Hrvati i Karolinzi. Rasprave i vrela*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 2000, 70–103.
- Ančić 2005 – M. Ančić, Lombard and Frankish Influences in the Formation of the Croatian Dukedom, in Brogiolo, G., Delogu, P. (eds.), *L'Adriatico dalla tarda antichità all'età carolingia: atti del convegno di studio, Brescia 11–13 ottobre 2001*, All'Insegna del Giglio, 2005, 213–228.
- Ančić 2016 – M. Ančić, Franački i langobardski utjecaji pri stvaranju i oblikovanju Hrvatske Kneževine, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 43, 2016, 217–238.
- Androshchuk 2014 – F. Androshchuk, *Viking Swords. Swords and Social Aspects of Weaponry in Viking Age Societies*, The Swedish History Museum, Studies 23, Historiska museet, 2014.
- Basić 2017–2018 – I. Basić, Natpis nadbiskupa Ursa kao izvor za crkvenu povijest ranosrednjovjekovnog Zadra (I. dio), *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 44–45, 2017–2018, 153–179.
- Belošević 1996 – J. Belošević, Dva kamena sarkofaga s Crkvine u Galovcu kod Zadra, *Arheološki radovi i rasprave* 12, 1996, 327–341.
- Belošević 1997 – J. Belošević, Počeci kršćanstva kod Hrvata u svjetlu arheološke građe, *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru* 36 (23), 1997, 101–140.
- Belošević 2000 – J. Belošević, Razvoj i osnovne značajke starohrvatskih grobalja horizonta 7. – 9. stoljeća na povijesnim prostorima Hrvata, *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru* 39 (26), 2000, 71–97.
- Belošević 2007 – J. Belošević, *Starohrvatsko groblje na Ždrijacu u Ninu*, Arheološki muzej Zadar, 2007.
- Belošević 2010 – J. Belošević, *Starohrvatsko groblje na Maklinovu Brdu u selu Kašiću kod Zadra / Altkroatisches Gräberfeld auf Maklinovo Brdo im Dorf Kašić bei Zadar*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 2010.
- Bilogriović 2009 – G. Bilogriović, Karolinški mačevi tipa K / Type K Carolingian Swords, *Opuscula archaeologica* 33, 2009, 125–182.
- Bilogriović 2011 – G. Bilogriović, O mačevima posebnog tipa u Hrvatskoj, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 38, 2011, 83–110.
- Bilogriović 2013 – G. Bilogriović, Carolingian Swords from Croatia – New Thoughts on an Old Topic, *Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis, Series Historica* 10, 2013, 67–83.
- Bilogriović 2014 – G. Bilogriović, Ratnici ili lovci? Noževi i strijele u grobovima na području ranosrednjovjekovne Hrvatske, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 41, 2014, 23–32.
- Bilogriović 2016 – G. Bilogriović, *Etnički identiteti u ranosrednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj – materijalni i pisani izvori*, unpublished PhD thesis, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, 2016.
- Bilogriović 2018a – G. Bilogriović, Carolingian Weapons and the Problem of Croat Migration and Ethnogenesis, in Dzino, D., Milošević, A., Vedriš, T. (eds.), *Migration, Integration and Connectivity on the Southeastern Frontier of the Carolingian Empire*, East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages 450–1450 50, Brill, 2018, 86–99.
- Bilogriović 2018b – G. Bilogriović, Uloga crkvenog namještaja u komuniciranju identiteta u ranosrednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj / The role of church furniture in the communication of identity in early medieval Croatia, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 111, 2018, 331–382.
- Bilogriović 2019a – G. Bilogriović, *Borna, dux Guduscanorum* – Local Groups and Imperial Authority on the Carolingian Southeastern Frontier, *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 25/1, 2019, 170–176.
- Bilogriović 2019b – G. Bilogriović, Ranosrednjovjekovni mačevi pod lupom Zdenka Vinskog, in Bunčić, M., Demo, Ž., Jarak, M. (eds.), *Zdenko Vinski – život i znanstveni rad*, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 2019, (forthcoming).
- Bojanovski 1974 – I. Bojanovski, Ranosrednjovjekovno utvrđenje u Vrbljanima na Sani, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu* 29, 1974, 245–258.
- Brather 2010 – S. Brather, Bestattungen und Identitäten – Gruppierungen innerhalb frühmittelalterlichen Gesellschaften, in Pohl, W., Mehofer, M. (eds.), *Archaeology of Identity / Archäologie der Identität*, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 17, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010, 25–49.
- Budak 2001 – N. Budak, *Karlo Veliki: Karolinzi i Hrvati*, Scintillae Stephano Gu-njaca dicatae 5, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 2001.
- Budak 2018 – N. Budak, *Hrvatska povijest od 550. do 1100.*, Povijest hrvatskih zemalja u srednjem vijeku 1, Leykam International, 2018.
- Burić 1996 – T. Burić, Istočnojadranske Sklavinije i Franci u svjetlu arheoloških nalaza, in Jurković, M., Lukšić, T. (eds.), *Starohrvatska spomenička baština: radanje prvog hrvatskog kulturnog pejzaža, Zbornik radova znanstvenog skupa održanog 6–8. listopada 1992.*, Muzejsko-galerijski centar, Odsjek za povijest umjetnosti Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 1996, 137–144.
- Cetinić 2010 – Ž. Cetinić, Starohrvatsko groblje Stranče – Gorica: osvrt na horizont grobova s poganskim načinom pokapanja, *Archaeologia Adriatica* 4, 2010, 1–23.
- Costambeys, Innes, MacLean 2011 – M. Costambeys, M. Innes, S. MacLean, *The Carolingian world*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Curta 2006 – F. Curta, Merovingian and Carolingian Gift Giving, *Speculum* 81, 2006, 671–699.
- Curta 2010 – F. Curta, A Note on Trade and Trade Centers in the Eastern and Northern Adriatic Region Between the Eighth and the Ninth Century, *Hortus artium medievalium* 16, 2010, 267–276.
- Demo 2010 – Ž. Demo, Ranosrednjovjekovno koplje s krilcima iz okolice Dugog Sela u svjetlu novih saznanja o ovoj vrsti oružja na motki, *Archaeologia Adriatica* 4, 2010, 61–84.
- Dzino 2010 – D. Dzino, *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat. Identity Transformations in Post-Roman and Early Medieval Dalmatia*, East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages 450–1450 12, Brill, 2010.
- Dzino 2014 – D. Dzino, The rise and fall of the Dalmatian “Big-men”: Social structures in Late Antique, Post-Roman and Early Medieval Dalmatia (ca. 500–850), *Studia academica šumenensia* 1, 2014, 127–152.
- Dzino, Milošević, Vedriš (eds.) 2018 – D. Dzino, A. Milošević, T. Vedriš (eds.), *Migration, Integration and Connectivity on the Southeastern Frontier of the Carolingian Empire*, East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages 450–1450 50, Brill, 2018.
- Geibig 1991 – A. Geibig, *Beiträge zur morphologischen Entwicklung des Schwerter im Mittelalter. Eine Analyse des Fundmaterials vom ausgehenden 8. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert aus Sammlungen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, Offa-Bücher 71, Karl Wachholtz Verlag, 1991.
- Giesler 1974 – U. Giesler, Datierung und Herleitung der vogelförmigen Riemenzungen, in Kossack, G., Ulbert, G. (eds.), *Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie 2, Festschrift für Joachim Werner zum 65. Geburtstag*, Münchner Beiträge zu Vor- und Frühgeschichte, Verlag C. H. Beck, 1974, 521–543.
- Goldstein 1995 – I. Goldstein, Uloga Bizanta u procesu etnogeneze Hrvata u IX. stoljeću, in Budak, N. (ed.), *Etnogeneza Hrvata*, Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1995, 105–109.
- Gračanin 2012 – H. Gračanin, Guduskani/Guduščani – Gačani: promišljanja o etnonimu Gačani i horonimu Gacka u svjetlu ranosrednjovjekovnih narativa i suvremenih historiografskih tumačenja, in Gračanin, H., Holjevac, Ž. (eds.), *Gacka u srednjem vijeku. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa održanog u Gackom pučkom otvorenom učilištu u Otočcu 5.–6. ožujka 2010*, Zbornici 42, Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar – Područni centar Gospić, 2012, 49–68.
- Härke 2001 – H. Härke, Cemeteries as places of power, in de Jong, M., Theuvs, F., van Rhijn, C. (eds.), *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, The tran-

- sformation of the Roman world 6, Brill, 2001, 9–30.
- Härke 2014 – H. Härke, Grave goods in early medieval burials: messages and meanings, *Mortality* 19/1, 2014, 41–60.
- Heather 1997 – P. J. Heather, Frankish Imperialism and Slavic Society, in Urbańczyk, P. (ed.), *Origins of Central Europe*, Scientific Society of Polish Archaeologists, 1997, 171–190.
- Hodder, Hutson 2003 – I. Hodder, S. Hutson, *Reading the past: Current approaches to interpretation in archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Jakšić 1989 – N. Jakšić, Crkve na Begovači i problem starohrvatskih nekropola, *Diadora* 11, 1989, 407–433.
- Jakšić 2000 – N. Jakšić, Klesarstvo u službi evangelizacije, in Milošević, A. (ed.), *Hrvati i Karolinzi. Rasprave i vrela*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 2000, 191–213.
- Jarak 2002 – M. Jarak, Zapažanja o grobljima 8. i 9. stoljeća u Dalmaciji, *Opuscula archaeologica* 26, 2002, 247–255.
- Jelovina 1976 – D. Jelovina, *Starohrvatske nekropole na području između rijeka Zrmanje i Cetine*, Čakavski sabor, 1976.
- Jelovina 1986 – D. Jelovina, *Mačevi i ostruge karolinškog obilježja u Muzeju hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika / Schwerter und Sporen karolingischer Formgebung in Museum kroatischer archäologischer Denkmäler*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 1986.
- Jelovina 1990 – D. Jelovina, Nikola Jakšić, Crkve na Begovači i problem starohrvatskih nekropola (kratki osvrt), *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 20, Split 1990, 301–308.
- Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981 – D. Jelovina, D. Vrsalović, Srednjovjekovno groblje na Begovači u selu Biljanima Donjim kod Zadra, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 11, 1981, 55–136.
- Jones 1997 – S. Jones, *The archaeology of ethnicity: constructing identities in the past and the present*, Routledge, 1997.
- Josipović 2012 – I. Josipović, Prijedlog za čitanje imena kneza Mislava na natpisu s Begovače / A proposed reading of prince Mislav's name in the Begovača inscription, *Archaeologia Adriatica* 6, 2012, 129–148.
- Jurčević 2009 – A. Jurčević, Usporedba skulpture i arhitekture s lokaliteta Crkvina u Gornjim Koljanima i Crkvina u Biskupiji kod Knina, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 36, 2009, 55–84.
- Jurčević 2011 – A. Jurčević, Nalazi ranokarolinškog oružja i konjaničke opreme u doba formiranja Hrvatske Kneževine, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 38, 2011, 111–147.
- Jurković 2000 – M. Jurković, Arhitektura karolinškog doba, in Milošević, A. (ed.), *Hrvati i Karolinzi. Rasprave i vrela*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 2000, 163–189.
- Klanica 2005 – Z. Klanica, Eliten auf Gräberfeldern altmährischer Zentren, in Kouřil, P. (ed.), *Die frühmittelalterliche Elite bei den Völkern des östlichen Mitteleuropas. Materialien der internationalen Fachkonferenz Mikulčice 25.–26. 5. 2004.*, Archeologický ústav Akademie věd České Republiky, 2005, 35–47.
- Kleemann 2002 – J. Kleemann, *Sachsen und Friesen im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert. Eine archäologisch-historische Analyse der Grabfunde*, Isensee Verlag, 2002.
- Kleemann 2010 – J. Kleemann, Karolingisches Fundgut im Südosten und das Verhältnis lokaler Eliten zum Karolingerreich, *Antaeus* 31–32, 2010, 81–91.
- Košta, Hošek 2014 – J. Košta, J. Hošek, *Early Medieval Swords from Mikulčice*, Studien zum Burgwall von Mikulčice 10, Archeologický ústav Akademie věd České Republiky, Brno, 2014.
- Kurasiński 2015 – T. Kurasiński, Burials with Buckets in Early Medieval Poland: A Pagan or Christian Custom?, *Analecta Archaeologica Ressorviensia* 10, 2015, 137–198.
- Le Jan 2000 – R. Le Jan, Frankish giving of arms and rituals of power: continuity and change in the Carolingian period, in Theuvs, F., Nelson, J. L. (eds.), *Rituals of power: From Late antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, The transformation of the Roman world 8, Brill, 2000, 281–309.
- Lennartsson 1997–1998. – M. Lennartsson, Karolingische Metallarbeiten mit Pflanzenornamentik, *Offa* 54–55, 1997–1998, 431–619.
- Madiraca et al. 2017. – V. Madiraca, M. Miletić, L. Bekić, V. Koprivnjak, T. Zubin Ferri, Ranosrednjovjekovni nalazi s lokaliteta Brekinjova Kosa (rezultati istraživanja 2011. i 2015. godine) / Early Medieval Finds from the Brekinjova Kosa Archaeological Site (Results of Excavations in 2011 and 2015), *Archaeologia Adriatica* 11, 2017, 145–215.
- Majnarić 2015 – I. Majnarić, Karolinško, Otonsko i Sveto Rimsko Carstvo, in Nikolić-Jakus, Z. (ed.), *Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu. Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku (oko 550 – oko 1150)*, Povijest Hrvata 1, Matica hrvatska, 2015, 517–532.
- Majnarić 2018 – I. Majnarić, *Aemulatio imperii and the south-eastern frontier of the Carolingian world*, in Ančić, M., Shepard, J., Vedriš, T. (eds.), *Imperial Spheres and the Adriatic. Byzantium, the Carolingians and the Treaty of Aachen (812)*, Routledge, 2018, 43–56.
- Marun 1898 – L. Marun, O najznamenitijim starohrvatskim grobovima na groblju otkrivene biskupske bazilike S. Marije u Biskupiji kod Knina, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 4/3–4, 1898, 113–118.
- Marun 1998 – L. Marun, *Starinarski dnevnik*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 1998.
- McCormick 2001 – M. McCormick, *Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce, AD 300–900*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- McKitterick 2008 – R. McKitterick, *Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity*, Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Menghin 1980 – W. Menghin, Neue Inschriftenschwerter aus Süddeutschland und die Chronologie karolingischer Späthen auf dem Kontinent, in Spindler, K. (ed.), *Vorzeit zwischen Main und Donau. Neue archäologische Forschungen und Funde aus Franken und Altbayern*, Erlanger Forschungen, Reihe A 26, Universitätsbund Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1980, 227–272.
- Milošević (ed.) 2000a – A. Milošević (ed.), *Hrvati i Karolinzi. Katalog*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 2000.
- Milošević(ed.) 2000b – A. Milošević (ed.), *Hrvati i Karolinzi. Rasprave i vrela*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 2000.
- Milošević 2000c – A. Milošević, Karolinški utjecaji u Hrvatskoj kneževini u svjetlu arheoloških nalaza, in Milošević, A. (ed.), *Hrvati i Karolinzi. Rasprave i vrela*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 2000, 106–139.
- Milošević 2005 – A. Milošević, Jesu li prilozu u grobovima ranog srednjeg vijeka u Dalmaciji posljedica poganskog obreda sahranjivanja?, *Histria Antiqua* 13, 2005, 457–460.
- Milošević 2006 – A. Milošević, Ranokarolinška brončana ostruga iz korita rijeke Cetine u Sinjskom polju, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku* 99, 2006, 299–307.
- Milošević 2009 – A. Milošević, Sarkofag kneza Branimira, *Histria Antiqua* 18/2, 2009, 355–370.
- Milošević 2012a – A. Milošević, Novi mač iz Koljana u svjetlu kontakata s nordijskim zemljama u ranom srednjem vijeku, *Histria Antiqua* 21, 2012, 459–470.
- Milošević 2012b – A. Milošević, O izvornoj funkciji križolikoga okova sa Ždrijaca u Ninu, in Jurković, M., Milošević, A. (eds.), *Munuscula in honorem Željko Rapanić. Zbornik povodom osamdesetog rođendana*, Dissertationes et Monographiae 5, International Research Center for Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages – Motovun, University of Zagreb, 2012, 191–211.
- Milošević 2013 – A. Milošević, *Tragovi starih vjerovanja u kršćanstvu ranoga srednjeg vijeka / Traces of Ancient Beliefs in Early Medieval Christianity*, Omega Engineering d.o.o., Centar "Studia Mediterranea" – Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Splitu, 2013.
- Milošević 2016a – A. Milošević, Doseljenje Hrvata u Dalmaciju krajem 8. stoljeća: mač K-tipa iz Koljana kao mogući dokaz / The Migration of the Croats to Dalmatia at the End of 8th Century: the K-Type Sword from Koljane as Possible Evidence, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 43, 2016, 239–262.
- Milošević 2016b – A. Milošević, The Arrival of the Croats in Late Eighth-Century Dalmatia: A K-type Sword from Koljane as Possible Evidence, u: Davison, D., Gaffney, V., Miracle, P., Sofaer, J. (eds.), *Croatia at the Crossroads: A consideration of archaeological and historical connectivity. Proceedings of a conference held at Europe House, Smith Square, London, 24–25 June 2013 to mark the accession of Croatia to the European Union*, Archaeopress Archaeology, 2016, 207–221.
- Milošević, Peković 2009 – A. Milošević, Ž. Peković, *Predromanička crkva Svetoga Spasa u Cetini / La chiesa preromanica di San Salvatore a Cettina*, Omega Engineering d.o.o., Centar "Studia Mediterranea" – Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Splitu, 2009.
- Moreland 2010 – J. Moreland, *Archaeology, Theory and the Middle Ages: Under-*

standing the Early Medieval Past, Duckworth, 2010.

Müller-Wille 1976 – M. Müller-Wille, Das Bootkammergrab von Haithabu (mit Beiträgen von Ole Crumlin-Pedersen und Maria Dekówna), *Berichte über die Ausgrabungen in Haithabu* 8, 1976, 7–176.

Nelson 2000 – J. L. Nelson, Carolingian royal funerals, in Theuvs, F., Nelson, J. L. (eds.), *Rituals of power: from Late antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, The transformation of the Roman world 8, Brill 2000, 131–184.

Pentz 2010 – P. Pentz, To vikingsværd med karolingisk planteornamentik i Nationalmuseets samlinger, *Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie*, 2010, 109–146.

Perović 2010 – Š. Perović, Osvrt na staklene priloge iz starohrvatskog groblja na Ždrijacu u Ninu, *Archaeologia Adriatica* 4, 2010, 37–52.

Petersen 1919 – J. Petersen, *De norske vikingesverd. En typologisk-kronologisk studie over vikingetidens vaaben*, I kommission hos Jacob Dybwad, 1919.

Petrinec 2005 – M. Petrinec, Dva starohrvatska groblja u Biskupiji kod Knina, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku* 98, 2005, 171–212.

Petrinec 2006 – M. Petrinec, Sedmi grob i nekoliko pojedinačnih nalaza s Crkvine u Biskupiji kod Knina, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 33, 2006, 21–36.

Petrinec 2009 – M. Petrinec, *Groblja od 8. do 11. stoljeća na području ranosrednjovjekovne hrvatske države*, Monumenta mediaevi Croatiae 3, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, 2009.

Petrinec 2010a – M. Petrinec, *By Their Fruit You Will Recognize Them: The Beginnings of Christianity Among the Croats in the Light of Archaeological Evidence*, in Dzieduszycki, W., Wrzesiński, J. (eds.), *Tak więc po owocach poznacie ich*, Stowarzyszenie Naukowe Archeologów Polskich, 2010, 193–201.

Petrinec 2010b – M. Petrinec, Brončana petlja ranokarolinške ostružne garniture s Putalja iznad Kaštel Sućurca, *Archaeologia Adriatica* 4, 2010, 53–59.

Petrinec 2014 – M. Petrinec, Frühmittelalterliche Gräber aus Orlic angeichts bisheriger Erkenntnisse über den Horizont mit heidnischen Bestattungsmerkmalen, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 42, 2015, 81–131.

Radić 1896 – F. Radić, Grobna raka iz starohrvatske biskupske bazilike S. Marije u Biskupiji kod Knina, i u njoj nadjeni mrtvački ostanci, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 2/2, 1896, 71–86.

Robak 2015 – Z. Robak, Items Decorated with the Tassilo Chalice Style in the Western Slavic Territories, *Slovenská archeológia* 63/2, 2015, 309–340.

Robak 2017 – Z. Robak, The Origins and the Collapse of the Blatnica-Mikulčice Paradigm, *Slovenská archeológia* 65/1, 2017, 99–162.

Schülke 1999 – A. Schülke, On Christianization and grave-finds, *European Journal of Archaeology* 2/1, 1999, 77–106.

Schulze-Dörrlamm 1993 – M. Schulze-Dörrlamm, Bestattungen in den Kirchen Grossmährens und Böhmens während des 9. und 10. Jahrhundert, *Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz* 40/2, 1993, 557–620.

Schulze-Dörrlamm 2009 – M. Schulze-Dörrlamm, Zeugnisse der Selbstdarstellung von weltlichen und geistlichen Eliten der Karolingerzeit (751–911), in Egg, M., Quast, D. (eds.), *Aufstieg und Untergang. Zwischenbilanz des Forschungsschwerpunktes "Studien zu Genese und Struktur von Eliten in vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Gesellschaften"*, Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz 82, Verlag des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz, 2009, 153–215.

Schulze-Dörrlamm 2010 – M. Schulze-Dörrlamm, Gräber mit Münzbeigabe im Karolingerreich, *Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz* 57/1, 2010, 339–388.

Shanks, Tilley 1992 – M. Shanks, C. Tilley, *Re-Constructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice*, Routledge, 1992.

Smith 2005 – J. M. H. Smith, *Europe after Rome: a new cultural history 500–1000*, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Sokol 2006 – V. Sokol, *Hrvatska srednjovjekovna arheološka baština od Jadrana do Drave*, Golden marketing-Tehnička knjiga, 2006.

Staecker 2005 – J. Staecker, The Concepts of imitatio and translatio: Perceptions of a Viking-Age Past, *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 38/1, 2005, 3–28.

Steuer 1987 – H. Steuer, Der Handel der Wikingerzeit zwischen Nord- und We-

steuropa aufgrund archäologischer Zeugnisse, in Düwel, K., Jankuhn, H., Simeis, H., Timpe, D. (eds.), *Untersuchungen zu Handel und Verkehr der vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Zeit in Mittel- und Nordeuropa*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987, 113–197.

Šlaus, Vyroubal, Bedić 2010 – M. Šlaus, V. Vyroubal, Ž. Bedić, Neke karakteristike kvalitete života i zdravlja socijalno povlaštenog muškarca pokopanog na starohrvatskom groblju na Ždrijacu u Ninu, *Archaeologica Adriatica* 4, 2010, 25–35.

Tomičić 2003 – Ž. Tomičić, Vjedrice hrvatskog ranog srednjovjekovlja, *Histria Antiqua* 10, 2003, 149–166.

Ungerma 2011 – Š. Ungerma, Schwertgurte des 9. bis 10. Jahrhunderts in West- und Mitteleuropa, in Macháček, J., Ungerma, Š. (eds.), *Frühgeschichtliche Zentralorte in Mitteleuropa. Internationale Konferenz und Kolleg der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung zum 50. Jahrestag des Beginns archäologischer Ausgrabungen in Pohansko bei Břeclav, 5.–9. 10. 2009, Břeclav, Tschechische Republik*, Studien zur Archäologie Europas 14, Verlag Dr. Rudolf Habelt, 2011, 575–608.

Ungerma 2015 – Š. Ungerma, Mečové pásky z 9.–10. století v západní a střední Evropě (typologie, chronologie, provenience a symbolika), in Pieta, K., Robak, Z. (eds.), *Bojná 2. Nové výsledky výskumov včasnostredovekých hradísk*, Archaeologica Slovaca Monographiae, Fontes 20, Archeologický ústav Slovenskej akadémie vied, 2015, 251–279.

Vinski 1977–1978 – Z. Vinski, Novi ranokarolinški nalazi u Jugoslaviji, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 10–11, 1977–1978, 143–208.

Vinski 1981 – Z. Vinski, O nalazima karolinških mačeva u Jugoslaviji, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 11, 1981, 9–54.

Vinski 1983 – Z. Vinski, Razmatranja o poslijekarolinškim mačevima 10. i 11. stoljeća u Jugoslaviji, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 13, 1983, 7–64.

Vinski 1985 – Z. Vinski, Marginalia uz izbor karolinškog oružja u jugoistočnoj Europi, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 15, 1985, 61–117.

Vrdoljak 1988 – B. M. Vrdoljak, Starokršćanska bazilika i ranosrednjovjekovna nekropola na Rešetarici kod Livna, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 18, 1988, 119–194.

Wachowski 1983 – K. Wachowski, Das Problem der Chronologie der karolingischen Einflüsse auf das Gebiet von Jugoslawien, *Zeitschrift für Archäologie des Mittelalters* 11, 1983, 163–167.

Wamers 1994 – E. Wamers, König im Grenzland. Neue Analyse des Bootkammergrabes von Haithabu, *Acta Archaeologica* 65, 1994, 1–56.

Wamers 2005 – E. Wamers, *Die Macht des Silbers: karolingische Schätzeim Norden*, Verlag Schnell & Steiner, 2005.


Wamers 2013 – E. Wamers, Tassilo III. von Bayern oder Karl der Große? Zur Ikonographie und Programmatik des sogenannten Tassilokelch-Stils, in Stennhauser, H. R. (ed.), *Wandel und Konstanz zwischen Bodensee und Lombardei zur Zeit Karl des Grossen. Kloster St. Johann in Müstair und Churrätien. Tagung 13.–16. Juni 2012 in Müstair*, Acta Müstair, Kloster St. Johann 3, vdf Hochschulverlag AG an der ETH Zürich, 2013, 427–448.

Werner 1960–1961 – J. Werner, Ranokarolinška pojasna garnitura iz Mogorjela kod Čapljine (Bosna i Hercegovina), *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu* 15–16, 1960–1961, 235–247.



Werner 1978–1979 – J. Werner, Zur Zeitstellung der altkroatischen Grabfunde von Biskupija-Crkvina (Marienkirche), *Schild von Steier* 15–16, 1978–1979, 227–237.

Williams 2005 – H. Williams, Review article: Rethinking early medieval mortuary archaeology, *Early Medieval Europe* 13/2, 2005, 195–217.


Zekan 1994 – M. Zekan, Karolinški i poslijekarolinški nalazi iz Bosne i Hercegovine, in Marijan, B. (ed.), *Livanjski kraj u povijesti*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika-Split, Općinsko hrvatsko vijeće obrane, 1994, 55–79.



1: 1.



1: 2.



1: 3.

TABLA 1

1: 1. Pojasna garnitura iz Mogorjela (Vinski 1977–1978, T. V: 1–2; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

1: 2. Pojasni jezičac iz Gornjih Vrbljana (Vinski 1977–1978, T. II: 1a–b; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

1: 3. Ostruga iz Gornjih Vrbljana (Vinski 1977–1978, T. VI: 1).

PLATE 1


1: 1. Belt set from Mogorjelo (Vinski 1977–1978, Pl. V: 1–2; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).

1: 2. Belt tongue from Gornji Vrbljani (Vinski 1977–1978, Pl. II: 1a–b; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).

1: 3. Spur from Gornji Vrbljani (Vinski 1977–1978, Pl. VI: 1).



2: 1.



2: 2.



2: 3.




2: 4.

TABLA 2.

- 2: 1. Morpolača, grob A. Balčak mača (snimio G. Bilogrivić).
 2: 2. Morpolača, grob A. Ostruga (Jelovina 1986, T. XVIII:207).
 2: 3. Orlić, grob A. Balčak mača (snimio G. Bilogrivić).
 2: 4. Orlić, grob B. Balčak mača (snimio G. Bilogrivić).

PLATE 2

- 2: 1. Morpolača, grave A. Sword hilt (photo by G. Bilogrivić).
 2: 2. Morpolača, grave A. Spur (Jelovina 1986, Pl. XVIII: 207).
 2: 3. Orlić, grave A. Sword hilt (photo by G. Bilogrivić).
 2: 4. Orlić, grave B. Sword hilt (photo by G. Bilogrivić).



3: 1.

3: 2.

3: 3.

TABLA 3.

3: 1. Biskupija-Crkvina, grob 1 (Jelovina 1986, T. I; T. II: 19–20; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

3: 2. Biskupija-Crkvina, grob 88 (Jelovina 1986, T. VII: 93–101).

3: 3. Biskupija-Crkvina, grob u sarkofagu podno sjeverne prostorije westwerka (Jelovina 1986, T. VI: 72–81).

PLATE 3

3: 1. Biskupija-Crkvina, grave 1 (Jelovina 1986, Pl. I; Pl. II: 19–20; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).

3: 2. Biskupija-Crkvina, grave 88 (Jelovina 1986, Pl. VII: 93–101).

3: 3. Biskupija-Crkvina, sarcophagus grave underneath the northern chamber of the westwork (Jelovina 1986, Pl. VI: 72–81).



4: 1.



4: 2.

TABLA 4.

4: 1. Biskupija-Crkvina, sarkofag iz groba podno sjeverne prostorije westwerka (Milošević 2000a, 209, IV. 38).

4: 2. Galovac-Crkvina, sarkofag (Milošević 2000a, 258, IV. 130a).

PLATE 4

4: 1. Biskupija-Crkvina, sarcophagus from the grave underneath the northern chamber of the westwork (Milošević 2000a, 209, IV. 38).

4: 2. Galovac-Crkvina, sarcophagus (Milošević 2000a, 258, IV. 130a).




TABLA 5.

5: 1. Gornji Koljani-Vukovića most, grob 1 (Jelovina 1986, T. XIV: 172–178; T. XV: 179–185; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

5: 2. Podgradina-Rešetarica, grob 4 (Milošević 2000a, 321, IV. 213a–f).


5: 3. Stranče-Gorica, grob 3A (Milošević 2000a, 209, IV. 239a–h).

PLATE 5

5: 1. Gornji Koljani-Vukovića Most, grave 1 (Jelovina 1986, Pl. XIV: 172–178; Pl. XV: 179–185; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).

5: 2. Podgradina-Rešetarica, grave 4 (Milošević 2000a, 321, IV. 213a–f):5:

5: 3. Stranče-Gorica, grave 3A (Milošević 2000a, 209, IV. 239a–h).



6. 1.

6. 2.

TABLA 6.


6. 1. Nin-Ždrijac, grob 74 (Belošević 2007, T. XI: 74; T. LVII: 3–10; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

6. 2. Nin-Ždrijac, grob 161 (Belošević 2007, T. XXII: 161; T. LXXIII–LXXIV; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

PLATE 6

6. 1. Nin-Ždrijac, grave 74 (Belošević 2007, Pl. XI: 74; Pl. LVII: 3–10; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).

6. 2. Nin-Ždrijac, grave 161 (Belošević 2007, Pl. XXII: 161; Pl. LXXIII–LXXIV; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).



7: 1.

7: 2.

TABLA 7.

7: 1. Nin-Ždrijac, grob 166 (Belošević 2007, T. XXIII: 167; T. LXXV: 13-18; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

7: 2. Nin-Ždrijac, grob 167 (Belošević 2007, T. XXIII: 167; T. LXXVI: 13-18; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

PLATE 7

7: 1. Nin-Ždrijac, grave 166 (Belošević 2007, Pl. XXIII: 166; Pl. LXXV: 13-18; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).

7: 2. Nin-Ždrijac, grave 167 (Belošević 2007, Pl. XXIII: 167; Pl. LXXVI: 13-18; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).



TABLA 8.

8: 1. Nin-Ždrijac, grob 312 (Belošević 2007, T. XLII: 312; T. C: 1–16; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

8: 2. Nin-Ždrijac, grob 324 (Belošević 2007, T. XLV: 324; T. CIV: 3–16; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

8: 3. Nin-Ždrijac, grob 322 (Belošević 2007, T. XLIV; T. CII–CIII; obradio G. Bilogrivić).

PLATE 8


8: 1. Nin-Ždrijac, grave 312 (Belošević 2007, Pl. XLII: 312; Pl. C: 1–16; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).

8: 2. Nin-Ždrijac, grave 324 (Belošević 2007, Pl. XLV: 324; Pl. CIV: 3–16; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).


8: 3. Nin-Ždrijac, grave 322 (Belošević 2007, Pl. XLIV; Pl. CII–CIII; adapted by G. Bilogrivić).




9: 1.



9: 2.



9: 3.



9: 4.

TABLA 9.

- 9: 1. Biljane Donje-Begovača, grob 253 (Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981, sl. 28).
 9: 2. Biljane Donje-Begovača, grob 253. Ostruge (Jelovina 1986, T. XII: 148–154).
 9: 3. Biljane Donje-Begovača, grob 258 (Jelovina 1986, T. XII: 155–164).
 9: 4. Gornji Koljani-Crkvina, ostruge iz groba uz crkvu (Jelovina 1986, T. XVII: 196–201).

PLATE 9

- 9: 1. Biljane Donje-Begovača, grave 253 (Jelovina, Vrsalović 1981, Fig. 28).
 9: 2. Biljane Donje-Begovača, grave 253. Spurs (Jelovina 1986, Pl. XII: 148–154).
 9: 3. Biljane Donje-Begovača, grave 258 (Jelovina 1986, Pl. XII: 155–164).
 9: 4. Gornji Koljani-Crkvina, spurs from the grave by the church (Jelovina 1986, Pl. XVII: 196–201).