

Ponovo o lasinjskoj bočici iz Vrlovke

Another look at a Lasinja Culture Bottle from Vrlovka

Izvorni znanstveni rad
Prapovijesna arheologija

Original scientific paper
Prehistoric archaeology

UDK/UDC 903.02(497.5–37 Kamanje)“636”
Primljeno/Received: 21. 06. 2007.
Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 10. 09. 2007.

TIHOMILA TEŽAK–GREGL
Odsjek za arheologiju
Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 3
HR – 10 000 Zagreb
ttgregl@ffzg.hr

Bogato ukrašena keramička bočica lasinjske kulture potiče autoricu na neka razmatranja o lasinjskoj kulturi i njezinu odnosu s retz-gajarskom kulturom.

Cljučne riječi: lasinjska kultura, retz-gajarska kultura, eneolitik, keramička bočica

A richly decorated ceramic bottle of the Lasinja culture prompts the author to certain reflections about the Lasinja culture and its relation with the Retz-Gajary culture.

Key words: the Lasinja culture, the Retz-Gajary culture, the eneolithic, a small ceramic bottle

Iako Željka Tomičića danas uglavnom prepoznajemo kao jednog od vodećih srednjovjekovaca u hrvatskoj arheologiji, prisjetila sam se ovom prigodom dva njegova rada iz područja prapovijesti. Kao mladi kustos radio je u varaždinskom i čakovečkom muzeju i kako to već biva, morao se baviti svim arheološkim razdobljima. Tako je 1969. godine izveo zaštitna istraživanja dva lasinjska lokaliteta, a to su Brezje kod Varaždina i Krč-Cerje Tužno kod Ivanca. O tim je nalazištima i izvijestio u Arheološkom pregledu za 1969. god. (Tomičić 1969). Stoga mi se kao prapovjesničarki, učinilo prikladnim povodom njegova jubileja posvetiti mu članak upravo s tematikom lasinjske kulture. A bočica iz špilje Vrlovke svakako je jedan od najreprezentativnijih keramičkih nalaza lasinjske kulture. No ima još jedna zgodna slučajnost – slična je bikonična bočica pronađena upravo na malo prije spomenutom lokalitetu Cerje Tužno, doduše u ranijim istraživanjima Stjepana Vukovića (Vuković 1954). Bočici iz Vrlovke, međutim, već dulje vrijeme neki autori odriču ovu atribuciju lasinjskoj kulturi (Marković 1986, 22; Marković 1994, 98; Čučković 1986, 9), a njihovo se mišljenje citira i u najnovijoj literaturi (Velušček 2004, 261).

Bočicu iz Vrlovke prvi je objavio Stojan Dimitrijević u izuzetno važnom članku o problemu neolitika i eneolitika u sjeverozapadnoj Jugoslaviji, u kojemu je zapravo i definirao pojam lasinjske kulture i dao joj spomenuto ime: „*Lasinjska kultura, koju je zasada najprikladnije nazivati prema najkarakterističnijem lokalitetu – Lasinja (na Kupa), dosad*

Even though Željko Tomičić is today most readily recognized as one of the leading medievalists in Croatian archaeology, on this occasion I remembered two of his works concerning prehistory. As a young curator he worked in the Varaždin and Čakovec Museums and, as is often the case, he had to deal with all archaeological periods. In 1969, for instance, he conducted rescue excavations at two sites of the Lasinja culture: Brezje near Varaždin and Krč-Cerje Tužno near Ivanec. He reported on these sites in the Arheološki pregled (Archaeological Review) for 1969 (Tomičić 1969). Therefore, being a prehistorian myself, I deemed it appropriate on the occasion of his jubilee to dedicate to him a paper dealing precisely with the topic of the Lasinja culture. And the small bottle from the Vrlovka cave is certainly one of the most representative ceramic finds of the Lasinja culture. What is more, there is another interesting coincidence – a similar small biconical bottle was found precisely at the aforementioned site of Cerje Tužno, albeit in earlier excavations by Stjepan Vuković (Vuković 1954). The bottle from Vrlovka, however, has for a long time now been denied attribution to the Lasinja culture by some authors (Marković 1986, 22; Marković 1994, 98; Čučković 1986, 9), whose opinion is quoted in the most recent literature (Velušček 2004, 261).

The bottle from Vrlovka was first published by Stojan Dimitrijević in his seminal work on the problem of the neolithic and eneolithic in northwestern Yugoslavia, in which he effectively defined the concept of the Lasinja culture and gave it the mentioned name: “*the Lasinja culture, for which it is at present most appropriate to use the name of the most characteristic site – Lasinja (on the Kupa river), is presently the*

je najbolje poznata kulturna grupa u razdoblju neolita i eneolita na spomenutom području" (Dimitrijević 1961).

Pobliže okolnosti nalaza bočice nisu poznate. S. Dimitrijević navodi tek da je „spilju Vrlovku kod Ozlja istraživala skupina speleologa 1958. god. i tom prilikom našla i nešto keramičkih, većim dijelom neukrašenih predmeta, a među njima i jednu vrlo lijepu malenu bočicu“ (Dimitrijević 1961, 33).¹ Međutim, prapovijesne nalaze iz Vrlovke prvi spominje Emil Laszowski u svojoj knjizi „Grad Ozalj i njegova okolina“ 1929. god., iako je već i prije pisao o špilji Vrlovki u Narodnim novinama i Prosvjeti. U spomenutoj knjizi izriječno kaže da je on sam u špilji našao „raznog prethistoričkog i rimskog oruđa i ulomaka posuda (hrbine, terracotta), pak i rimske novce cara Claudijana II.“ (Laszowski 1926, 94). Spominje i nalaze ljudskih kostiju.

Razrađujući oblike keramičkih posuda, S. Dimitrijević u citiranom radu, navodi bikoničnu bočicu kao jedan od posebno karakterističnih predmeta za lasinjsku kulturu, spominjući osim Vrlovke nalaze iz Cerja Tužnog, Brezja kod Zreča i Drulovke (Dimitrijević 1961, 42). Godine 1979. u sinteznom Dimitrijevićevu poglavlju o lasinjskoj kulturi u sklopu Praistorije jugoslavenskih zemalja III, svoje je mjesto ponovo našla bočica iz Vrlovke (Dimitrijević 1979, 159-160). Međutim, 1986. god. Z. Marković je iznio drukčije mišljenje o kulturnoj atribuciji bočice: „Među neobjavljenim materijalom iz Vrlovke postoje također elementi srodni lenđelskim kulturama, a jedini primjerak s ukrasima – poznata bočica s bogatom dekoracijom i bijelo inkrustiranim ornamentima – svojim izgledom i dekoracijom sugerira nam recgajarsko shvaćanje ornamentiranja, dakle, jedno evoluirano-lasinjsko shvaćanje, kakvo niti na jednom lasinjskom lokalitetu na kojemu su pronađene bočice ne postoji. Stoga ovaj lokalitet ne ubrajamo u lokalitete lasinjske kulture na tome području“.

I nešto kasnije, 1994. god. Z. Marković ponavlja mišljenje da bočica iz spilje Vrlovke, prije pripisivana lasinjskoj kulturi, vjerojatno pripada Višnjica tipu Retz-Gajary kulture, ističući sličnost njezine ornamentike s nekim primjercima Mondsee tipa Retz-Gajary kulture, po čemu potpuno odudara od svih do sada poznatih lasinjskih bočica (Marković 1994, 98).

Bočica iz Vrlovke po mom je shvaćanju ipak lasinjska. To u prvom redu sugerira njezin oblik, takvih bočica nema nigdje u kontekstu retz-gajarskih tipova, dok su prisutne na većem broju nedvojbeno lasinjskih lokaliteta. S druge strane, ukras doista pokazuje ispreplitanje stilskih obilježja lasinjske i retzgajarske kulture, kako je to već davno utvrdio i S. Dimitrijević (Dimitrijević 1979, 177-178).²

Dakle, moguće je stilske sličnosti naći i na materijalu koji navodi Z. Marković u Mondsee tipu Retz-Gajary kulture, ali

best known cultural group in the neolithic and eneolithic periods in the mentioned territory" (Dimitrijević 1961).

Nothing more specific is known about the discovery of the bottle. S. Dimitrijević states only that "the Vrlovka cave near Ozalj was investigated in 1958 by a group of speleologists, who found on that occasion some ceramic, mostly undecorated objects, including a lovely small bottle" (Dimitrijević 1961, 33). However, the prehistoric finds from Vrlovka were first mentioned by Emil Laszowski in his book "The Town of Ozalj and its Surroundings" in 1929, even though he had previously already written about the Vrlovka cave in Narodne Novine and Prosvjeta. In the mentioned book he explicitly states that in the cave he himself found "various prehistoric and Roman tools and fragments of vessels (sherds, terracotta), as well as Roman coins of emperor Claudian II." (Laszowski 1926, 94). He also mentions finds of human bones.

Developing the classification of the ceramic vessel shapes, in the quoted paper S. Dimitrijević describes the small bottle as one of the objects particularly characteristic for the Lasinja culture, mentioning in addition to Vrlovka also the finds from Cerje Tužno, Brezje near Zreče and from Drulovka (Dimitrijević 1961, 42). The small bottle from Vrlovka again found its place in Dimitrijević's 1979 synthetic chapter on the Lasinja culture within the Prehistory of Yugoslav Lands III, (Dimitrijević 1979, 159-160). However, in 1986 Z. Marković offered a different opinion regarding the cultural attribution of the bottle: "Among the unpublished material from Vrlovka there are also elements akin to the Lengyel cultures, while the only decorated piece – the famous small bottle with rich decoration and white-incrusted ornaments – points by virtue of its shape and decoration to the ornamental concept of the Retz-Gajary culture, meaning an evolved Lasinja concept, not present on any site of the Lasinja culture where bottles were found. Therefore, we do not include this site among the Lasinja sites in that territory".

Somewhat later, in 1994, Z. Marković reiterated his opinion that the bottle from the Vrlovka cave, previously attributed to the Lasinja culture, probably belongs to the Višnjica type of the Retz-Gajary culture. He pointed out the similarity of its ornamental design with certain specimens of the Mondsee type of the Retz-Gajary culture, by which it contrasts entirely from all so far known Lasinja bottles (Marković 1994, 98).

Even so, in my opinion the bottle from Vrlovka belongs to the Lasinja culture. This is primarily suggested by its shape, as there are no bottles of this kind within the context of the Retz-Gajary types, whereas they are present in a considerable number of sites that undoubtedly belong to the Lasinja culture. On the other hand, the decoration indeed shows intertwining of stylistic features of the Lasinja and Retz-Gajary cultures, as had been determined by S. Dimitrijević long ago (Dimitrijević 1979, 177-178).²

It is therefore possible to find stylistic resemblances also in the material mentioned by Z. Marković in the Mondsee type of the Retz-Gajary culture, but that still does not mean

1. S. Dimitrijević bočicu opisuje: „Potpuno sačuvana bikonična bočica s poliranom prevlakom od oker do tamnosive boje. Glina sadrži primjese pijeska. Ukrašena urezivanjem, kratkim zarezima i ubadanjem. Bijela inkrustacija vrlo dobro sačuvana. Visina 9 cm, promjer usta 3-3,4 ramena 5,6-6,5 dna 1,3 cm.“

1. Dimitrijević's description of the small bottle: "A completely preserved small biconical bottle with a polished slip ranging from ochre to dark grey. The clay contains additions of sand. Decorated with incision, small notches and stabbing. White incrustation very well preserved. Height 9 cm, diameter of the mouth 3-3,4, of the shoulders 5,6-6,5 cm, of the base 1,3 cm".

to još uvijek ne znači da bočicu iz Vrlovke treba smjestiti u kontekst retz-gajarske kulture. Nažalost, kao što je već rečeno, arheološki kontekst nalaza bočice nije poznat. Osim nje, iz Vrlovke potječe još nešto ulomaka nedvojbeno prapovijesne keramike. Neki od njih pokazuju obilježja kasne lenđelske keramike, dok su ostali netipični pa ih nije moguće kulturološki opredijeliti. No činjenica da na nedalekom Starom gradu u Ozlju, osim keramičkih nalaza kasne lenđelske kulture, ima i tipičnih nalaza lasinjske kulture, slično kao i u Movernoj Vasi, obližnjem slovenskom lokalitetu, jasno govori da je spomenuti pokupski prostor naseljen nositeljima lasinjske kulture (Težak-Gregl 1993; Budja 1992). Tipičnih, pak, Retz-Gajary nalaza zasad nema potvrđenih, što naravno ne znači da ih u budućnosti neće biti – primjerice, A. Velušček horizonte 8 i 9 u Movernoj Vasi pripisuje keramici s brazdastim urezivanjem, kako on naziva Retz-Gajary kulturu (Velušček 2004, 250-251).

Što se samog oblika posude tiče, ona ima paralele u nalazima iz Cerja Tužnog, iz Brezja kod Zreča, Drulovke (Korošec 1958-1959), i nekoliko nalaza sličnih bikoničnih bočica s područja Križevaca, uvijek u okružju tipično lasinjskih nalaza. Ondje je na lokalitetima Bukovje i Beketinec pronađeno ukupno 6 primjeraka, 3 gotovo cijele i tri očuvane samo u donjem dijelu (Homen 1985). Bočice iz Beketince potječu iz iskopavanja provedenih 1979. god. Lokalitet je nedvojbeno lasinjski (Homen 1980) kao i lokalitet Ždralovi-Dolina kod Bjelovara gdje je pokusnim iskopavanjem 1984. također pronađena jedna bikonična keramička bočica (Gerić 1990, 71, sl. 3). Promotrimo li dobro križevačke primjerke vidjet ćemo da se u osnovnoj koncepciji nimalo ne razlikuju od ozaljskog. Riječ je o izrazito bikoničnim oblicima, s jako naglašenim prijelomom, uskim otvorom te proširenim obodom. Na naglašenom ramenom dijelu nalaze se dvije ušice, a još dvije rupice nalaze se na proširenom obodu otvora posuda. Razlika je samo u znatno bogatijem ukrasu na ozaljskoj bočici u odnosu na skromni ukras križevačkih bočica, no kod svih je primjeraka ukras izveden kombinacijom urezivanja i ubadanja. Njihovu je funkciju pokušao razjasniti Z. Homen zahvaljujući činjenici da je u jednoj od njih bila zemlja s jasno vidljivim tamnim i pomalo masnim tragovima (Homen 1985). Sadržaj bočice dao je analizirati na Farmaceutsko-biokemijskom fakultetu u Zagrebu. Nažalost, očuvana količina tvari bila je vrlo mala i k tome pomiješana sa zemljom, što je otežavalo

that the Vrlovka bottle should be placed in the context of the Retz-Gajary culture. Unfortunately, as has already been said, the archaeological context of the discovery of the bottle is not known. Apart from the bottle there are several other sherds of indisputably prehistoric pottery originating from Vrlovka. Some show features of the late Lengyel culture, while the remainder is untypical and therefore unsuitable for a cultural attribution. However, the fact that nearby, at the Castle in Ozalj, in addition to the ceramic finds of the late Lengyel culture one also encounters typical finds of the Lasinja culture, similar to Moverna Vas, a Slovenian site lying nearby, clearly speaks that the mentioned territory along the Kupa river basin (Pokuplje) was populated by the bearers of the Lasinja culture (Težak-Gregl 1993; Budja 1992). On the other hand, so far there have been no documented finds of the Retz-Gajary culture, which of course does not mean that none will be found in the future – e.g. A. Velušček attributes horizons 8 and 9 at Moverna Vas to the furrow-incision ware, the name he uses for the Retz-Gajary culture (Velušček 2004, 250-251).

When it comes to the exact shape of the vessel, it has parallels in the finds from Cerje Tužno, Brezje near Zreče, Drulovka (Korošec 1958-1959), and several finds of similar biconical small bottles from the Križevci area, always in the context of typical Lasinja finds. There, at the sites of Bukovje and Beketinec, altogether 6 pieces were found: 3 almost complete vessels and three that are preserved only in the lower part (Homen 1985). The small bottles from Beketinec come from the excavation conducted in 1979. The site indisputably belongs to the Lasinja culture (Homen 1980) same as the site of Ždralovi-Dolina near Bjelovar, where the 1984 sondage excavations likewise yielded a small biconical ceramic bottle (Gerić 1990, 71, Fig. 3). If we look carefully at the pieces from Križevci we will see that their basic concept does not in the least differ from the Ozalj concept. Their shape is markedly biconical, with a highly pronounced break, narrow mouth and widened rim. The pronounced shoulder has two suspension loops, and there are a further two perforations on the widened rim of the mouth of the vessels. The only difference lies in the far richer decoration on the Ozalj bottle in comparison to the modest decoration of the Križevci bottles, even though all the pieces bear decoration effected by a combination of incision and stabbing. Z. Homen attempted to shed light on their function owing to the fact that one of them contained soil with clearly visible dark and somewhat greasy traces (Homen 1985). He had the content of the bottle analyzed at the Faculty of Pharmacy and Biochemistry in Zagreb. Unfortunately, the preserved quantity of the matter was too small and, what is more, mixed with soil, which made the analysis more difficult. The chemical method of identification based on analytical and spectro-

2. „Ukrašavanje finog posuđa daje bitne osobine ovog stupnja i njegova dekorativnog stila. Taj se trend manifestira u nekoliko glavnih odrednica....nastup krivolinijskih uzoraka – girlandi, popunjenih paralelnim snopovima linija, nastup tzv. ljestvičastih uzoraka koji podsjećaju na bodrogkereszturske, također i motiva bodljikave žice; čitav dekorativni sustav je složeniji, a u njemu vidnu ulogu igraju meandarski uzorci koji u mnogome podsjećaju na stilska rješenja poznata iz bodrogkereszturske kulture. Kasna ili baroknoklasična faza lasinjske kulture vrijeme je punog procvata lasinjske kulture, njena najindividualnija etapa, vrijeme kada se ona izvukla iz jednodušnosti i nemaštovitosti u keramografskom stvaralaštvu, iz previše velike privrženosti kasneolitskoj tradiciji. Kada se kaže baroknoklasična, onda se, naravno, misli na tip nalaza poput onih iz Gradca i Novoselca kod Pleternice, Lasinje i Vrlovke, koji bitno odskakuju iz dosadašnje fizionomije lasinjske kulture, prije svega, svojim smislom za raskošniji pristup ukrašavanju keramičkih proizvoda.“

2. “The decoration of fine pottery lends the essential features of this phase and its decorative style. This trend finds expression in several main determinants...the appearance of curvilinear patterns – garlands, filled with parallel bundles of lines, the appearance of the so-called scale-shaped patterns reminiscent of the Bodrogkeresztúr ones, also the barbed wire motifs; the entire system of decoration is more complex, with a prominent role played by the meander motifs in many respects reminiscent of the stylistic concepts known from the Bodrogkeresztúr culture. The late or baroque-classical phase of the Lasinja culture is the time of the full flourishing of the Lasinja culture, its most individual period, the time when it escaped the monotony and unimaginativeness in ceramic design and an all too strong adherence to the late neolithic tradition. The term “baroque-classical” naturally refers to types of finds such as those from Gradac and Novoselec near Pleternica, from Lasinja and Vrlovka, which differ considerably from the previous physiognomy of the Lasinja culture, primarily by virtue of their disposition toward a more lavish approach to decoration of ceramic objects.”



Sl. 1 Lasinjska bočica iz Vrlovke (snimio G. Vranić)
 Fig. 1 Lasinja Bottle from Vrlovka (photo by G. Vranić)

analizu. Kemijskom metodom identifikacije utemeljene na analitičkim i spektroskopskim metodama te gravimetrijskom analizom utvrđena je prisutnost organskih tvari u tragovima, te nekih anorganskih kationa i aniona (kobalt, aluminij, cink, željezo). Spektri nuklearno magnetske rezonancije, NMR, uputili su na postojanje estera, kojima preteče mogu biti eterična ulja. Njihovu prisutnost, međutim, nije bilo moguće dokazati izravno, kao ni prisutnost nekih mirisa anorganskog podrijetla, jer je riječ o tvarima koje na zraku hlape i u doticaju s kisikom oksidiraju te prelaze u neke svoje derivate. Dakle, jedini zaključak provedene analize jest da se u bočici najvjerojatnije držalo kakvo eterično ulje ili mirisi. Bočice posebnoga oblika, opremljene s dvije ušice na istaknutome ramenom dijelu te još dvije manje na izvučenom rubu usta, što sugerira da su se vješale ili nosile u ruci, po svoj su prilici korištene pri nekim posebnim obredima. Kojim i kakvim, teško je reći jer još uvijek vrlo malo znamo o duhovnim aspektima lasinjske kulture. Zasadu najzanimljiviji pokazatelj toga segmenta života lasinjske populacije uočen je u Ajdovskoj jami, špiljskom lokalitetu koji je služio ukopnom ritualu (Korošec P. 1980-1981). I bočica iz Vrlovke potječe iz špilje, prostora koji je tek povremeno korišten u određene svrhe, bilo kao pribježište u vremenima različitih opasnosti, bilo kao obredni prostor. Možda su nositelji lasinjske kulture, koji su živjeli u široj okolici špilje, što je potvrđeno i na ozaljskom starom gradu i u Movernoj Vasi, špilju koristili za neke sasvim osebujne rituale o kojima je nijemi svjedok ostala tek jedna keramička bočica. No ono što se čini daleko važnijim jest činjenica da

scopic methods and the gravimetric analysis established the presence of organic matter in trace elements as well as certain inorganic cations and anions (cobalt, aluminium, zinc, iron). The nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectra indicated the existence of esters, which may have originated from essential oils. However, it was not possible to establish their presence directly, just as in the case of certain scents of inorganic origin, because these are substances that volatilize in air, and oxidize in contact with oxygen, transforming into certain derivatives. Therefore, the only conclusion of the conducted analysis is that the bottle probably served as a container for essential oils or scents. Small bottles of specific shape, equipped with two perforated lugs on the pronounced shoulder and a further two smaller ones on the everted rim of the mouth, suggesting that they were suspended or carried in hand, were in all likelihood used during specific rituals. Which rituals and of what nature, it is still difficult to say, because we still know very little about the spiritual aspects of the Lasinja culture. For the time being, the most interesting indicator of that segment of life of the Lasinja population has been observed in Ajdovska Jama, a cave site used for a burial ritual (Korošec P. 1980-1981). The Vrlovka bottle also comes from a cave, a space only occasionally used for certain purposes, either as a refuge during times of peril or as a ritual zone. Perhaps the bearers of the Lasinja culture living in the wider surroundings of the cave, as has been testified both at the Castle in Ozalj and at Moverna Vas, were using the cave for some entirely idiosyncratic rituals which left a single mute witness in the shape of a small ceramic bottle. But what appears to be far more important is the fact that the small bottle from Vrlovka raises the question of the relationship between the Lasinja and the Retz-Gajary culture as well as the question of the existence of two types

bočica iz Vrlovke nameće pitanje odnosa lasinjske i retz-gajarske kulture kao i pitanje postojanja dva Retz-Gajary tipa na području Hrvatske. Naime, nedavno je jasno pokazano kako jedan od lokaliteta koji su S. Dimitrijeviću poslužili za definiranje Kevderc-Hrnjevac tipa, a to je Kevderc, ima i nalaza keramike ukrašene brazdastim urezivanjem (Velušček 2004, 236-240). Dakle, glavna odrednica razlike između spomenuta dva tipa, prisutnost, odnosno odsutnost tehnike brazdastog urezivanja, otpada. Čini se da je i tamo slična situacija kao u Drljanovcu, gdje je A. Durman utvrdio prisutnost oba tipa u istom objektu (Durman 1982, 39-40, 43). Inače u kronološkom smislu S. Dimitrijević vidi djelomičnu istodobnost lasinjske i retz-gajarske kulture, smatrajući Višnjica tip paralelnim ranoklasičnoj Lasinji IIa, a Kevderc-Hrnjevac Lasinji III (Dimitrijević 1979a, 363-364).

Pišući o odnosu retz-gajarske i lasinjske kulture S. Dimitrijević (1979a, 364) kaže: „Na tlu sjeverne Jugoslavije napose su zanimljivi odnosi retz-gajarske i lasinjske kulture. Kao što je lasinjska kultura utjecala na retz-gajarsku kulturu, tako je došlo i do povratnog utjecaja. Taj reverzibilni proces se napose iskazuje u najmlađoj, baroknoj etapi lasinjske kulture (Lasinja III), kada dolazi do stvaranja jednog bujnog dekorativnog stila uz upotrebu inkrustacije. Tom prilikom će se nerijetko iskazivati frapantne srodnosti između ove dvije manifestacije.“

Kakav je, zapravo, relativno-kronološki odnos lasinjske i retz-gajarske kulture? Upoznali smo već kod S. Dimitrijevića pretpostavku o barem djelomičnoj istodobnosti dviju pojava, odnosno čak djelomičnom njihovu suživotu. Slično mišljenje iskazuje i A. Durman na temelju nalaza iz Drljanovca (Durman 1982, 42). Međutim, u novije vrijeme A. Velušček, temeljito razrađivši nalaze s područja Slovenije, uzevši u obzir stratigrafske podatke i radiokarbonske datume, pledira za prioritet lasinjske kulture u odnosu na keramiku s brazdastim urezivanjem tj. retz-gajarsku, iako navodi neke lokalitete u Sloveniji i Austriji koji bi mogli svjedočiti i o njihovoj djelomičnoj istodobnosti (Velušček 2004, 250-260).

Za rješavanje pitanja odnosa tih dviju kultura od posebnog bi značenja bio višeslojni lokalitet Pepelana kod Virovitice. Ondje je K. Minichreiter izdvojila tri građevinska horizonta Retz-Gajary kulture, međusobno odijeljena čvrstim podnicama, uvjetno ih odredivši kao Retz-Gajary I, II i III (Minichreiter 1990, 29-37). Smatra kako ova činjenica mijenja dosadašnju sliku o populaciji Retz-Gajary kulture za koju se smatralo da je nomadska (Dimitrijević 1980, 54). Trajnost naseljavanja kao i ne isključivo nomadski karakter Retz-Gajary kulture potvrđuje i A. Velušček temeljem nalaza iz Slovenije (Velušček 2004, 232). Međutim, kada je Pepelana u pitanju, ono malo građe koja je objavljena, ne pokazuje uvjerljivo da je riječ o Retz-Gajary kulturi. Osobno uočavam znatno više lasinjskih elemenata. Uostalom, i sama K. Minichreiter u opisu keramičkih nalaza vrlo često ističe kako su „imitacija“ lasinjskih (Minichreiter 1990, 32). Tako za jednu tipičnu lasinjsku zdjelu, koja je međutim iznimno ukrašena, kaže da je lasinjskog oblika s retz-gajarskim ukrasom. No takvih urezanih ukrasa imamo i na nalazima tipične lasinjske kulture. Također, ističe još neke oblike, primjerice, vjedra

of the Retz-Gajary culture in the territory of Croatia. To clarify, it has recently been clearly demonstrated that one of the sites used by S. Dimitrijević for the definition of the Kevderc-Hrnjevac type – the Kevderc site – also produced finds of pottery decorated with furrow-incisions (Velušček 2004, 236-240). Therefore, the main determinant of difference between the two mentioned types – the presence or absence of the furrow-incision technique, is no longer valid. It appears that the situation there is similar to the one in Drljanovac, where A. Durman established the presence of both types within the same structure (Durman 1982, 39-40, 43). Regarding chronology, in Dimitrijević's opinion the Lasinja and Retz-Gajary cultures are partly synchronous, with the Višnjica type parallel to the early classical Lasinja IIa, while the Kevderc-Hrnjevac type is parallel with the Lasinja III (Dimitrijević 1979a, 363-364).

Writing about the relationship between the Retz-Gajary and the Lasinja culture Dimitrijević (1979a, 364) says: *“In the territory of northern Yugoslavia the relationship between the Retz-Gajary and the Lasinja culture is highly interesting. Just as the Lasinja culture influenced the Retz-Gajary culture, there was influence in the other direction as well. This reversible process is most obvious in the latest, baroque stage of the Lasinja culture (Lasinja III), when a lavish decorative style including the use of incrustation comes into being, and when a striking resemblance will often be apparent between these two manifestations.”*

What is in fact the nature of the relative-chronological relationship between the Lasinja and the Retz-Gajary culture? We have already learned of Dimitrijević's assumption about the contemporaneity, at least partial, of the two phenomena, even of their partial coexistence. A similar opinion is put forward by A. Durman on the basis of the discovery from Drljanovac (Durman 1982, 42). However, recently A. Velušček, having thoroughly analyzed the finds from the territory of Slovenia, having considered the stratigraphic data and radiocarbon dates, argued for the priority of the Lasinja culture with respect to the furrow-incision ware, i.e. the Retz-Gajary culture, even though he mentioned certain sites in Slovenia and Austria that might bear testimony also to their partial contemporaneity (Velušček 2004, 250-260).

The multi-layer settlement of Pepelana near Virovitica plays a special role in clarifying the relationship of these two cultures. K. Minichreiter distinguished three construction horizons of the Retz-Gajary culture, separated one from another by solid floors, to which she applied the names of Retz-Gajary I, II and III (Minichreiter 1990, 29-37). In her view this fact changes the picture valid until now about the Retz-Gajary population, previously considered nomadic (Dimitrijević 1980, 54). The permanence of settlement and a not-exclusively nomadic character of the Retz-Gajary culture is also corroborated by A. Velušček on the basis of the finds from Slovenia (Velušček 2004, 232). However, when it comes to Pepelana, the little material that has been published does not offer satisfactory proof that we are dealing with the Retz-Gajary culture. Personally, I perceive many more elements belonging to the Lasinja culture. Actually, in her description of the ceramic finds, K. Minichreiter herself often stresses that they are an “imitation” of the Lasinja ones (Minichreiter 1990, 32). Thus, in the case of a typical Lasinja bowl, which is however decorated in an exceptional way, she says that it has a Lasinja shape with a Retz-Gajary decoration. However, we find such incised decorations even on the finds of the typical Lasinja culture. Also, she points to some other shapes, e.g. buckets with a beaked spout, bowls on a higher bell-shaped foot, high feet imitating

s kljunastim izljevom, posude na višoj zvonolikoj nozi, visoke noge koje imitiraju lasinjske itd. Čak i kod ukrasa vidi „imitacije“ lasinjskih ukrasa. Dakle, u najmanju ruku horizont Retz-Gajary I se, sudeći prema objavljenom materijalu, daleko više pokazuje kao lasinjski nego retz-gajarski, a čini se da to vrijedi i za horizont II, dok je III nešto drukčiji. No kako je objava još uvijek preskromna, teško se može nešto više reći. K. Minichreiter Pepelanu pripisuje Višnjica tipu, mada se nigdje ne vidi, niti u tekstu ne spominje brazdasto urezivanje (Minichreiter 1986, 32). Z. Marković spomenute horizonte smješta u okvire hrnjevačkog tipa (Marković 1994, 98). Stoga možemo zaključiti da će tek potpuna i temeljita obrada i objava keramičkog materijala iz Pepelane riješiti pitanje njegove kulturne pripadnosti te odnosa lasinjske i retz-gajarske kulture. Važan doprinos tom pitanju bilo bi i radiokarbonsko datiranje kako lasinjskih tako i retz-gajarskih nalaza na području Hrvatske, ali tim datumima zasad ne raspolažemo.

the Lasinja ones etc. Even in the decorations she sees "imitations" of those in the Lasinja culture. Therefore, horizon Retz-Gajary I, judging by the published material, exhibits, to say the least, far more Lasinja features than those of the Retz-Gajary culture, and it appears that the same would apply for horizon II, whereas horizon III is somewhat different. Nevertheless, as the publication is still too modest, it is difficult to say anything more. K. Minichreiter attributes Pepelana to the Višnjica type, even though furrow-incision is nowhere to be seen, nor is it mentioned in the text (Minichreiter 1986, 32). Z. Marković places the mentioned horizons within the frame of the Hrnjevac type (Marković 1994, 98). We can therefore conclude that only a comprehensive and thorough analysis and publication of the ceramic material from Pepelana will solve the question of its cultural affiliation and of the relationship between the Lasinja and the Retz-Gajary culture. An important contribution to that question would consist of the radiocarbon dates of the Lasinja finds as well as those of the Retz-Gajary culture in the territory of Croatia, but these dates are presently not at our disposal.

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY :

- Budja M., 1992, Pečatniki v slovenskih neolitskih naselbinskih kontekstih, Poročilo XX, Ljubljana, 95-111.
- Čučković L., 1986, Arheološka topografija karlovačke regije. u: Arheološka istraživanja na karlovačkom i sisačkom području, IzdanjaHAD 10, Zagreb 9-18.
- Dimitrijević S., 1961, Problem neolita i eneolita u sjeverozapadnoj Jugoslaviji., OpusA V, Zagreb, 5-85.
- Dimitrijević S., 1979, Lasinjska kultura, PJZ III (Eneolit), Sarajevo, 137-183.
- Dimitrijević S., 1979a, Retz-Gajary kultura, PJZ III (Eneolit), Sarajevo, 343-367.
- Dimitrijević S., 1980, Zur Frage der Retz-Gajary-Kultur in Nordjugoslawien und ihrer Stellung im pannonsischen Raum, BerichtRGK 61, Frankfurt a. M., 17-88.
- Durman A., 1982, Prilog stratificiranju Kevderc-Hrnjevac tipa retz-gajarske kulture, OpusA 7, Zagreb, 37-47.
- Gerić B., 1985, Probno iskapanje lasinjskog naselja na lokalitetu "Dolina" kod Ždralova, MuzVjes 8, Koprivnica, 41-44.
- Gerić B., 1989 (1990), Rasprostranjenost naselja lasinjske kulture na bjelovarskom području, u: Arheološka istraživanja u Podravini i kalničko-bilogorskoj regiji, IzdanjaHAD 14, Koprivnica, 69-73.
- Homen Z., 1980, Lasinjski nasebinski elementi i novi nalazi iz Beketinca, MuzVjes 3, Koprivnica 1980, 42-48.
- Homen Z., 1985, Prilog proučavanju lasinjskih keramičkih bočica, MuzVjes 8, Koprivnica, 44-47.
- Homen Z. 1990, Lokaliteti lasinjske kulture na križevačkom području, u: Arheološka istraživanja u Podravini i kalničko-bilogorskoj regiji, IzdanjaHAD 14, Koprivnica, 51-69.
- Korošec J., 1958- 1959, Miniaturne steklenice v neolitu Jugoslavije, AVes IX-X/1, Ljubljana, 3-13.
- Korošec P., 1980-1981, Neuere archäologische Forschungen in der Höhle Ajdovska jama bei Nemška Vas in Verbindung mit dem Totenkult, Alug XX-XXI, Beograd, 12-16.
- Laszowski E., 1929, *Grad Ozalj i njegova okolina*, Zagreb
- Marković Z., 1977, Problem eneolita u našičkoj regiji – prilog genezi i stupnjevanju lasinjske kulture, AVes 27, Ljubljana, 42-68.
- Marković Z., 1980, Krč kod Beketinca i završetak neolita u sjeverozapadnoj Hrvatskoj, Poročilo 8, Ljubljana, 27.
- Marković Z., 1983, Prilog poznavanju razvijene i kasne lasinjske kulture u sjeverozapadnoj Hrvatskoj, PodrZbor 83, Koprivnica, 251-262.
- Marković Z., 1986, Neki problemi geneze i razvoja lasinjske kulture, u: Arheološka istraživanja na karlovačkom i sisačkom području, IzdanjaHAD 10, Zagreb, 19-29.
- Marković Z., 1994, *Sjeverna Hrvatska od neolita do brončanog doba*, Koprivnica
- Minichreiter K., 1990., Prvi rezultati arheoloških istraživanja u Pepelana godine 1985., u: Arheološka istraživanja u Podravini i kalničko-bilogorskoj regiji, IzdanjaHAD 14 (1989), Zagreb, 19-39.
- Težak-Gregl T. 1993, Prapovijesno nalazište Ozalj-Stari grad, OpusA 17, Zagreb, 165-183.
- Tomičić Ž., 1969, Krč, Cerje Tužno – Ivanec – eneolitsko naselje lasinjske kulture, ArhPregl 11, Beograd, 33-35, T. XII.
- Velušček A., 2004, *Hočevarica*, OIAS 8, Ljubljana
- Vuković S., 1954, Ostaci neolitičkih nalazišta Draguševac i Krč, Peristil I, Zagreb, 135-141.