

# Odgovor na kritiko datacije prostorskega križa s krkavškim Kamnom

*Andrej Pleterski*

Kolega Matej Župančič večinoma zelo smiselno povzema sklepe najine razprave o krkavškem Kamnu. Najina prostorsko nekoliko nerodna umestitev razprave o času nastanka cerkve papeža sv. Štefana, takoj za retoričnim vprašanjem, kdaj je nastala prostorska struktura križa (Puhar, Pleterski 2005, 68), pa je kritika očitno zavedla k napačni trditvi v sklepu št. 8, da prostorski križ datirava tudi z arheološkimi ostanki cerkve papeža sv. Štefana. V resnici najina datacija temelji izključno in samo na primerjavi s prostorskim križem v Pragi, ki pa se zdi kritiku "še posebno prepričljiv". Prav tako ne vključujeva v datacijsko argumentacijo zvoka zvonov, ki potrjuje zgolj kulturni pomen prostora. Nadalje sam priznava, da puščava vprašanje graditelja prostorskega križa odprto. Možnost, ki jo kritik ponuja s koprskim škofom Absalomom v začetku 13. st., bi se približno še ujela s časom dokončanja križa v Pragi v drugi polovici 12. stoletja. Tudi začetek 13. st. bi bil za nastanek krkavškega križa še sprejemljiv.

Ni pa mi jasno kritikovo stališče do najinega sklepa, da je Kamen povzročil nastanek prostorskega križa in je torej stal že pred njegovo postavitvijo. Najprej namreč zapiše, da je ta sklep "nedvoumen", pozneje pa mu je "z datacijskimi nedorečenostmi še bolj nezanesljivo". Gre za preprosto vprašanje relativne kronologije: je bil Kamen postavljen zaradi križa, ali križ zaradi Kamna. Vsi podatki o Kamnu in srednjeveška ideologija križa govorijo za drugo možnost. Se kritik s tem strinja in ima samo pomisleke ob absolutni kronologiji?

Vsekakor je na mestu njegovo opozorilo, da se astronomska smer zidov, ki jih je odkopal Vinko Šribar, ne ujema z godom papeža sv. Štefana. Kako to pojasniti? Natančen pregled Šribarjeve objave izkopavanj (Šribar 1967) pokaže samo to, da je naletel na najmanj dve, morda celo tri stavbe iz različnih časov, da je izkopal verjetno dve časovni skupini grobov, od katerih je ena mlajša od ne najmlajše stavbe. Pridatke v nekaterih grobovih je mogoče samo okvirno datirati v celotni razpon visokega in poznega srednjega veka. V ruševinski plasti je bila rimska opeka. Šribarjeva "prepričljiva" datacija v 14. st. je zgolj historična in temelji na goli trditvi, da so v 14. st. zgradili sosednjo farno cerkev v Krvavčah ter podružnici sv. Mavra in sv. Štefana mučenca ter trditvah, da odkriti ostanki pripadajo cerkvi sv. Štefana papeža in da je ta prav tako nastala v 14. stoletju (Šribar 1967, 372–373). Verjeti gre ljudskemu izročilu, da je tam nekje res stala cerkev sv. Štefana papeža, tudi je skoraj gotovo, da je Šribar odkril nekaj okolnih grobov. Povsem nejasno pa je, kaj so odkriti zidovi. Celotne zgradbe iz rimske dobe niso nemožne. Vsekakor bi bilo potrebno narediti muzejsko revizijo najdb in dokumentacije, še bolj pa bi bila revizijska izkopavanja. Brez tega je diskusija o cerkvi sv. Štefana papeža brez pomena.

Kritika Mateja Župančiča tako poudarja potrebo po novih raziskavah. S čimer se lahko samo strinjamo. Argumentacije o Kamnu in prostorskem križu kritika ne spremi-

nja, dodaja pa dobro misel o koprskem škofu Absalonu kot možnem "avtorju" prostorskega križa.

**Literatura:**

Puhar, Jana – Pleterski, Andrej 2005, Krkvški Kamen v ustnem izročilu in v sklopu obredne prostorske strukture. – *Studia mythologica Slavica* 8, Ljubljana, 57–74.

Šribar, Vinko 1967, Skeletno plano grobišče na Hribu pri Krkvčah. – *Arheološki vestnik* 18, Ljubljana, 365–375.

## Response to the Critique Regarding the Dating of the Spatial Cross from the Krkavče Stone

Andrej Pleterski

My colleague Matej Župančič for the most part quite reasonably summarizes the resolutions from our discussion about the Krkavče Stone. Our spatially somewhat awkward positioning of the discussion concerning the time of origin of the Church of Sv. Štefan the Pope, that is directly after the rhetorical question regarding the origins of the spatial structure of the cross (Puhar, Pleterski 2005, 68), evidently misled the critic to an erroneous statement in the conclusion of no. 8: that we also date the spatial cross on the basis of the archaeological remains of the Church of Sv. Štefan the Pope. Our dating in fact is founded exclusively upon analogies with the spatial cross in Prague, which the critic finds to be »particularly convincing«. Furthermore, our dating argumentation does not include the bell tones, which merely confirm the cultic significance of the area. In the continuation, Župančič also acknowledges that our question of who built the spatial cross remains pending. The critic proffers the possibility of it being the Koper bishop Absalon in the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century; this would approximately coincide with the time of the completion of the cross in Prague in the second half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. The beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century would also be acceptable for the origins of the Krkavče cross.

Nonetheless, the critic's opinion concerning our conclusion that the Stone occasioned the formation of the spatial cross and hence that the Stone stood prior to the erection of the cross, remains unclear. Initially the critic states the inference as »unequivocal«, and then later as »with dating insufficiencies, even more unreliable«. It is a simple matter of relative chronology: was the Stone erected because of the cross, or was the cross because of the Stone? All data concerning the Stone and the medieval ideology of the cross bespeak the latter explanation. So, does the critic concede and just have doubts regarding the absolute chronology?

His cautioning that the astronomic direction of the walls excavated by Vinko Šribar does not coincide with the name day of the pope Sv. Štefan is by all means on the spot. What are the justifications for this? A detailed examination of Šribar's excavation publications (Šribar 1967) reveals only that he uncovered at least two, perhaps even three structures from various periods, and that he excavated probably two different chronological groups of graves, of which one is later than the *not* latest structure. The material finds discovered in select graves may only be approximately dated to the entire span of the High and Late Middle Ages. The layer of ruins comprised of Roman bricks. Šribar's »convincing« dating to the 14<sup>th</sup> century is nothing more than historical. It is founded merely on the assertion that in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the neighboring parish church in Krkavče was built, along with its subsidiaries Sv. Maver and Sv. Štefan the Martyrs, as well as the assertions that the discovered remains belong to the Church of Sv. Štefan the Pope and that it was also built in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. One is inclined to believe the popular folklore that the Church of Sv. Štefan the Pope truly did stand somewhere in the nearby vicinity. Furthermore, it is almost certain that Šribar did indeed uncover several graves in the nearby surroundings of the church. However, the nature of the discovered walls remains entirely undetermined. That they were elements of structures from the Roman period is not even altogether implausible. Unquestionably, a museological complete revision of the

material finds and documentation - even more so of the excavations - would seem of great necessity. To further deliberate over the Church of Sv. Štefan the Pope is, without such an endeavor quite insignificant.

The critique regarding Matej Župančič thus emphasizes the necessity for further investigation. One can only agree with this. The critique fails to prompt any alteration in the argumentation concerning the Stone and spatial cross; rather it puts forward a worthy consideration of the Koper bishop Absalon as a possible »author« of the spatial cross.