

# Kasnosrednjovjekovna plemićka kurija kraj Orahovice - Uvod u razumijevanje kasnosrednjovjekovne kurije u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj

---

**Emić, Marin**

*Source / Izvornik:* **Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu, 2021, 38, 115 - 155**

**Journal article, Published version**


**Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)**

<https://doi.org/10.33254/piaz.38.2.4>

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:291:909249>

*Rights / Prava:* [Attribution 3.0 Unported](#)/[Imenovanje 3.0](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2025-02-22**



INSTITUT ZA  
ARHEOLOGIJU

*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[RIARH - Repository of the Institute of archaeology](#)



DIGITALNI AKADEMSKI ARHIVI I REPOZITORIJI

UDK 902  
ISSN 1330-0644  
Vol. 38/2  
ZAGREB, 2021.

# PRILOZI

Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu

Pril. Inst. arheol. Zagrebu, 38/2/2021  
Str./Pages 1–218, Zagreb, 2021.

Izdavač/*Publisher*  
INSTITUT ZA ARHEOLOGIJU  
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Adresa uredništva/*Address of the editor's office*  
Institut za arheologiju/*Institute of archaeology*  
HR–10000 Zagreb, Jurjevska ulica 15  
Hrvatska/*Croatia*  
Telefon/Phone ++385/(0)1 61 50 250  
Fax ++385(0)1 60 55 806  
e-mail: urednistvo.prilozi@iarh.hr  
<http://www.iarh.hr>

Glavni i odgovorni urednik/*Editor in chief*  
Marko DIZDAR

Tehnički urednici/*Technical editors*  
Marko DIZDAR  
Katarina BOTIĆ

Uredništvo/*Editorial board*  
Marko DIZDAR, Snježana VRDOLJAK, Viktória KISS (Budapest, HUN) (prapovijest/*Prehistory*), Goranka LIPOVAC VRKLJAN, Ivan RADMAN-LIVAJA (antika/*Antiquities*), Tajana SEKELJ IVANČAN, Katarina Katja PREDOVNIK (Ljubljana, SLO), Natascha MEHLER (Wien, AUT), Tatjana TKALČEC (srednji vijek i novi vijek/*Middle Ages and Modern era*), Predrag NOVAKOVIĆ (Ljubljana, SLO) (metodologija/*Methodology*)

Izdavački savjet/*Editorial advisory board*  
Dunja GLOGOVIĆ (Zagreb), Ivor KARAVANIĆ (Zagreb), Laszlo KÓVACS (Budapest, HUN), Kornelija MINICHREITER (Zagreb), Aleksandar RUTTKAY (Nitra, SK), Ivančica SCHRUNK (Minneapolis, USA), Željko TOMIČIĆ (Zagreb), Ante UGLEŠIĆ (Zadar)

Prijevod na engleski/*English translation*  
Inga VILOGORAC BRČIĆ, Kristina DESKAR, Igor KULENOVIĆ, Irena RADIĆ ROSSI, Saba RISALUDDIN

Lektura/*Language editor*  
Ivana MAJER, Marko DIZDAR (hrvatski jezik/*Croatian*)  
Marko MARAS, Kristina DESKAR (engleski jezik/*English*)

Korektura/*Proofreads*  
Katarina BOTIĆ

Grafičko oblikovanje/*Graphic design*  
Umjetnička organizacija OAZA

Računalni slog/*Layout*  
Hrvoje JAMBREK

Tisak/*Printed by*  
Sveučilišna tiskara d.o.o., Zagreb

Naklada/*Issued*  
400 primjeraka/400 copies

Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu uključeni su u sljedeće indekse/  
Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu are included in following indices:  
DYABOLA – Sachkatalog der Bibliothek – Römisch-Germanische Kommission des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts, Frankfurt a. Main  
Clarivate Analytics services – Web of Science Core Collection  
CNRS/INIST – Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique/L'Institut de l'Information Scientifique et Technique, Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy  
EBSCO – Information services, Ipswich  
ERIH – European Reference Index for the Humanities, European Science Foundation, Strasbourg  
SciVerse Scopus – Elsevier, Amsterdam

E-izdanja. Publikacija je dostupna u digitalnom obliku i otvorenom pristupu na  
<https://hrcak.srce.hr/prilozi-iaz>  
*E-edition. The publication is available in digital and open access form at*  
<https://hrcak.srce.hr/prilozi-iaz?lang=en>

Ovaj rad licenciran je pod Creative Commons Attribution By 4.0 međunarodnom licencom /  
*This work is licenced under a Creative Commons Attribution By 4.0 International Licence*



## Sadržaj

## Contents

### Izvorni znanstveni radovi

### Original scientific papers

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| 5   | IGOR KULENOVIĆ<br>ŠIME VRKIĆ<br>VEDRANA GLAVAŠ<br>NEDA KULENOVIĆ OCELIĆ<br>Vidljivost kao element strukturiranja krajolika –<br>Primjer višeperiodnoga arheološkog lokaliteta<br>Bojnik na ušću rijeke Zrmanje | IGOR KULENOVIĆ<br>ŠIME VRKIĆ<br>VEDRANA GLAVAŠ<br>NEDA KULENOVIĆ OCELIĆ<br><i>Visibility as an element of landscape structuring –<br/>An example of multi-period archaeological site<br/>Bojnik at the mouth of Zrmanja river</i> |
| 43  | ADNAN BUSULADŽIĆ<br>Antičke kopče iz muzejskih zbirki u Bosni i<br>Hercegovini (izbor nalaza)  | ADNAN BUSULADŽIĆ<br><i>Buckles of Antiquity from the Museum Collections of<br/>Bosnia and Herzegovina (a selection)</i>   |
| 89  | JURAJ BELAJ<br>FILOMENA SIROVICA<br>ŽELJKA BEDIĆ<br>Crkva Uznesenja Blažene Djevice Marije u Gori<br>kraj Petrinje i faze ukopavanja grobova na prostoru<br>sakristije   | JURAJ BELAJ<br>FILOMENA SIROVICA<br>ŽELJKA BEDIĆ<br><i>Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin<br/>Mary in Gora near Petrinja and the phases of the<br/>burials in the area of sacristy</i>                                |
| 115 | MARIN EMIĆ<br>Kasnosrednjovjekovna plemička kurija<br>kraj Orahovice – Uvod u razumijevanje<br>kasnosrednjovjekovne kurije u kontinentalnoj<br>Hrvatskoj   | MARIN EMIĆ<br><i>Late Medieval Manor House near Orahovica –<br/>Introduction into the Understanding of a Late<br/>Medieval Manor House in Continental Croatia</i>   |
| 157 | INES ŠELENDIĆ<br>IRENA RADIĆ ROSSI<br>Novi stakleni nalazi iz tereta broda Gagliana grossa<br>potonuloga kod otočića Gnalića 1583.   | INES ŠELENDIĆ<br>IRENA RADIĆ ROSSI<br><i>New glass finds from the cargo of the ship Gagliana<br/>grossa, sunk near the islet of Gnalić in 1583</i>  |

## Prethodno priopćenje

- 199 INGA VILOGORAC BRČIĆ  
LAURENT BRICAULT  
Mithras in Teutoburgium

## Prikaz

- 205 DOMAGOJ TONČINIĆ  
Studia honoraria archaeologica. Zbornik radova u  
prigodi 65. rođendana prof. dr. sc. Mirjane Sanader,  
Tončinić D., Kaić I., Matijević V., Vukov M. (eds.)

- 211 UPUTE AUTORIMA

## Preliminary report

- INGA VILOGORAC BRČIĆ  
LAURENT BRICAULT  
*Mitra u Teutoburgiju*

## Book review

- DOMAGOJ TONČINIĆ  
*Studia honoraria archaeologica. Special volume  
on the occasion of the 65th birthday of prof. dr.  
Mirjana Sanader; Tončinić D., Kaić I., Matijević V.,  
Vukov M. (eds.)*

- GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

# Kasnosrednjovjekovna plemićka kurija kraj Orahovice – Uvod u razumijevanje kasnosrednjovjekovne kurije u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj

## *Late Medieval Manor House near Orahovica – Introduction into the Understanding of a Late Medieval Manor House in Continental Croatia*

Izvorni znanstveni rad  
Srednjovjekovna arheologija

*Original scientific paper  
Medieval archaeology*

MARIN EMIĆ  
Gajić 54  
HR-31500 Našice  
emic.marin@gmail.com

UDK/UDC 904:728.82(497.5 Orahovica)“653”

Primljeno/Received: 24. 12. 2020.

Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 11. 05. 2021.

*U radu su predstavljeni rezultati analize dijela pokretnih nalaza prikupljenih arheološkim istraživanjima kurije kraj Orahovice 2017. i 2019. godine. Također, donose se rezultati proučavanja kurije u odnosu na slične rezidencije na području srednjovjekovnoga Ugarskog Kraljevstva. Srednjovjekovna kurija kraj Orahovice nalazi se u podnožju Ružice grada, jedne od najvećih utvrda u Hrvatskoj. Orahovičkim posjedom vladali su brojni istaknuti pojedinci među kojima se ističe Nikola Iločki kao jedan od najvećih magnata kasnosrednjovjekovnoga Ugarskog Kraljevstva. Iznimno malo izvora spominje kuriju te pri tome ne donose dodatne informacije o njoj. Arheološka istraživanja započela su 2017. godine te su nastavljena 2019. i 2020. godine. Od pokretnih nalaza pronađeni su uglavnom karakteristični kasnosrednjovjekovni i ranonovovjekovni keramički nalazi. Značajan je nalaz novca Žigmunda Luksemburškog kovan između 1430. i 1437. godine. Za sada su prepoznate tri faze dogradnji zidova na glavnu troprostornu zgradu kurije. Istraživanjima 2020. godine otkrivene su strukture u blizini kurije koje ukazuju na postojanje većega kompleksa. Na području kontinentalne Hrvatske do sada nisu prepoznate i istražene slične kasnosrednjovjekovne kurije. Proučavanjem kuriji kraj Orahovice sličnih rezidencija na području kasnosrednjovjekovnoga Ugarskog Kraljevstva uočena je skupina rezidencijalno-gospodarskih kompleksa koja bi mogla igrati važnu ulogu u razumijevanju i interpretaciji rezultata daljnjih arheoloških istraživanja na ovome lokalitetu.*

*Ključne riječi: Orahovica, knezovi Iločki, plemićka rezidencija, troprostorna podjela, kurija, curia nobilitaris*

*This paper presents the results of the analysis of a portion of movable finds gathered during the archaeological research of the manor house near Orahovica in 2017 and 2019. Likewise, this paper brings results of the study of the manor house compared to similar residences in the medieval Kingdom of Hungary. The medieval manor house near Orahovica is situated at the foot of the Ružica grad, one of the biggest castles in Croatia. The estate was ruled by numerous prominent individuals, among others, Nicholas of Ilok, who was one of its most notable owners and one of the biggest magnates of the late medieval Kingdom of Hungary. Very few sources mention the manor house, and the ones that do, do not offer any additional information about it. Archaeological excavations began in 2017 and continued in 2019 and 2020. Movable finds discovered mostly include typical late medieval and early modern ceramic finds. Sigismund of Luxembourg, Holy Roman Emperor's coin minted between 1430 and 1437 is a significant find. Thus far, there are three recognized phases of additions to the main three-room building. The excavations conducted in 2020 revealed structures in the vicinity of the manor house, which point to the existence of a larger complex. In continental Croatia, there are no similar late medieval manor houses known and excavated so far. Research of manor houses in the area of the late medieval Kingdom of Hungary similar to the one near Orahovica enabled the detection of a group of residential and economic complexes which could play an important role in understanding and interpreting the results of further archaeological research of this site.*

*Key words: Orahovica, Dukes of Ilok, aristocratic residence, three-room structure, manor house, curia nobilitaris*

## UVOD

Kurija kraj Orahovice rezidencijalni je kompleks udaljen 700 m zračne linije od Ružice grada. Svojim pristupačnim položajem služila je za udobnije stanovanje, a vjerojatno je igrala i svrhu gospodarskoga središta. Za sada provedene tri kampanje istraživanja pokazale su izniman značaj ovoga kompleksa. U hrvatskoj se literaturi, po pitanju ovoga tipa rezidencije, nailazi na nedostatak spoznaja i istraživanja, zbog čega se bilo potrebno okrenuti rezultatima istraživanja u drugim državama koje su u kasnome srednjem vijeku bile dio Ugarskoga Kraljevstva. Proučavanjem radova iz mađarske, češke i slovačke literature dolazi se do spoznaje kako je kurija kraj Orahovice pripadala široj grupi plemićkih rezidencija koje su na ostalim područjima srednjovjekovnoga Ugarskog Kraljevstva puno bolje istražene. Ovaj rad nastao je na osnovi diplomskoga rada obranjenoga 2020. godine (Emić 2020). U njemu se nastoji proučiti kuriju kraj Orahovice iz što je više moguće različitih perspektiva.

## INTRODUCTION

The manor house near Orahovica is a residential complex 700 m away from Ružica grad air distance. Due to its accessible position, it was used for comfortable living and it probably also served as an economic centre. Three excavation campaigns conducted so far revealed the immense significance of this complex. Since there is a scarcity of findings and research in Croatian literature regarding this type of residence, it was necessary to turn to results of research conducted in other countries that were part of the Kingdom of Hungary in the Late Middle Ages. The study of Hungarian, Czech, and Slovakian literature leads us to the conclusion that the manor house near Orahovica belonged to a wider group of aristocratic residences that are researched far better in other areas of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary. This paper is based on a master's thesis defended in 2020 (Emić 2020). It tries to analyse the manor house near Orahovica from as many perspectives as possible. It opens many questions and creates links to understand the



Karta 1 Smještaj kurije u odnosu na Ružica grad i Orahovicu (kartografska osnova: Geoportal DGU; doradio: M. Emić)  
 Map 1 Position of the manor house in relation to Ružica grad and Orahovica (map base: Geoportal DGU; supplemented by: M. Emić)

Otvaraju se brojna pitanja te se stvaraju poveznice kako bi se što bolje razumjelo kuriju, ne samo na lokalnoj, nego i na široj razini. Važno je naglasiti kako je istraživanje glede samoga razmjera kompleksa, zidova te prostorija tek u začecima, a ovom će se prigodom opisati arhitektonski rezultati istraživanja.<sup>1</sup> Analizom keramike prikupljene istraživanjima 2017. i 2019. godine pokušat će se približiti kronološki aspekt i način života u ovoj kasnosrednjovjekovnoj kuriji. Cilj ovoga rada je napraviti dvojaku analizu kao uvod u poznavanje kurije kraj Orahovice – s jedne strane vidjeti kakve se informacije mogu dobiti analizom materijala, a s druge strane što se sve može saznati proučavanjem kuriji kraj Orahovice sličnih rezidencija. U tom se pogledu u radu donose rezultati istraživanja kurija izvan Hrvatske koji mogu biti od velike koristi za proučavanje ovoga tipa rezidencije u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj.

manor house better, not only on the local level but also on a wider scale. It is important to stress that the research of the proportions of the complex themselves, its walls, and rooms, is in its early stage, and this paper will try to depict the architectural results of the research.<sup>1</sup> The analysis of ceramics collected by research in 2017 and 2019 will try to approach the chronological aspect and way of life in this late medieval manor house. This paper aims to conduct two parallel analyses, in the form of an introduction into the understanding of the manor house near Orahovica – to see which information can be acquired through the analysis of material on the one hand, and through the study of manor houses similar to the one near Orahovica on the other. With regards to that, this paper brings the results of research on manor houses outside Croatia that can be of great help for the study of this type of residence in continental Croatia.

<sup>1</sup> Arheološka istraživanja proveo je Hrvatski restauratorski zavod 2017., 2019. i 2020. godine pod vodstvom Andreja Janeša, dipl. arheologa. Autor ovoga rada sudjelovao je u istraživanjima 2019. i 2020. godine.

<sup>1</sup> Archaeological excavations were conducted by the Croatian Conservation Institute in 2017, 2019, and 2020 under the leadership of Andrej Janeš, archaeologist. The author of this paper participated in the excavations in 2019 and 2020.

## KRATKI POVIJESNI PREGLED

Povijest orahovičkoga područja usko je vezana uz planinu Papuk i njezin istočni nastavak Krndiju. Orahovički posjed i grad nalazili su se u Križevačkoj županiji (Andrić, Radić 2004: 12; Pálosfalvi 2014: 370, bilj. 140) te su bili dio Požeškoga arhiđakonata koji se preko Krndije iznimno protezao do Orahovice (Andrić 2008: 58). Starija cesta, koja je najvjerojatnije bila glavna i u srednjem vijeku, a vidljiva je na habsburškoj vojnoj karti iz 1782. godine, prolazila je ispod Ružice grada te dalje pokraj Starog grada i preko vrha Kapavca (najvišega vrha Krndije) na drugu stranu Krndije (Andrić, Radić 2004: 8). Ona je bila glavni transverzalni put između Save i Drave (Radić 2014: 72). Prema tome, orahovičke su utvrde, kao brojne druge koje su nastale na ovome masivu, vršile nadzornu ulogu nad putevima preko planine Papuk i njezinih nastavaka. Spomenički kompleks srednjovjekovnoga grada Ružice, u koji pripada i kurija ispod nje, predstavlja jedinstvenu spomeničku cjelinu u Hrvatskoj (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 5). Ružica pripada u red najvećih srednjovjekovnih utvrda u Hrvatskoj te se u sklopu nje nalazi i prostorno najveća gradska kapela (Horvat 1999: 193; Andrić, Radić 2004: 7). Tu je još i utvrda koja je u novome vijeku poznata kao Stari grad. Ona nije istražena, ali Gjuro Szabo donosi brojne pojedinosti poput informacija da tlocrt zidova pokazuje podjelu grada u četiri dijela, da su graditelji koristili pećine za temelje zidova, da Stari grad duljinom premašuje i samu Ružicu te da je stariji od nje (Szabo 1914: 99; 1920: 136). Stari grad se nalazi samo 2 kilometra južnije od Ružice grada, na oko 700 m n. v. Istraživanja su pokazala da je Ružica grad nastao krajem 14. i početkom 15. st. (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 5). Stoga, vrijeme nastanka Starog grada treba tražiti negdje prije toga.

Brojne su velike ličnosti kasnosrednjovjekovne hrvatske povijesti imale vlast nad orahovičkim posjedom na kojemu se nalazila kurija. Istraživanjem njih otvaraju se mogućnosti izdvajanja pojedinaca kao potencijalnih graditelja kurije kraj Orahovice ili graditelja nadogradnji. Nikola Kont bio je daleko najznačajniji član svoga roda i jedan od glavnih velikaša za vladavine kralja Ludovika I. (Mažuran 2008: 14–15). Njegovi sinovi Bartol i Nikola nisu se puno bavili orahovičkim posjedom, pa je Orahovica uglavnom ostala u rukama njihovih rođaka potomaka Lőkösa Jakobovog, bratića Nikole Konta, koji je bio pravi začetnik loze orahovičkih (Andrić, Radić 2004: 13; Andrić 2008: 85). Za razvoj orahovičkoga područja u kasnome srednjem vijeku bila je važna vladavina kralja Žigmunda, specifična po svojoj naravi, koja je omogućila uspon obitelji Iločki i njezina najistaknutijeg člana Nikole. U vrijeme Nikole i njegovoga sina Lovre Ružica grad doživljava procvat (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 5). U tom pogledu logično je zaključiti da niti 800 m udaljena kurija nije ostala zapostavljena. No, trenutni stupanj istraženosti ne dopušta donošenje konkretnih zaključaka o tome tko je gradio ili nadograđivao kuriju. Istraženi posjedi Nikole Iločkog ukazuju na veliku graditeljsku aktivnost ovoga magnata.

## SHORT HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The history of the Orahovica area is closely linked to Papuk Mountain and its eastern extension, Krndija. The estate and town of Orahovica were situated in Križevci County (Andrić, Radić 2004: 12; Pálosfalvi 2014: 370, n. 140) and were part of the Archdeaconry of Požega, exceptionally spreading over Krndija to Orahovica (Andrić 2008: 58). An older road, which probably served as the main road in the Middle Ages as well, is visible on a Habsburg military survey from 1782. It passed below Ružica grad and went further, along Stari grad, and over the Kapavac Mountain Peak (the highest peak of Krndija Mountain) to the other side of Krndija (Andrić, Radić 2004: 8). It was the main transversal road between the Sava and Drava Rivers (Radić 2014: 72). Therefore, Orahovica castles, like many other castles built in this massif, were used for surveillance over the roads of Papuk Mountain and its extensions. The monumental complex of the medieval town of Ružica, which includes the manor house below, represents a unique monumental unit in Croatia (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 5). Ružica is one of the biggest medieval castles in Croatia and it includes the spatially largest town chapel (Horvat 1999: 193; Andrić, Radić 2004: 7). There is also a castle, which was known in the modern period as Stari grad (old town). It has not been researched, but Gjuro Szabo brings many details, for example, the information that the ground plan of the walls shows that the town was divided into four parts, that the builders used caves for wall foundations, that Stari grad supersedes Ružica grad in length and is older than Ružica grad (Szabo 1914: 99; 1920: 136). Stari grad is situated only two kilometres south of Ružica grad and 700 m a.s.l. Research has shown that Ružica grad was built at the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 5). Therefore, the time Stari grad was built should be sometime before that.


Numerous great figures of late medieval Croatian history ruled over the Orahovica estate on which the manor house lied. Research into them opens possibilities of identifying individuals as potential builders of the manor house near Orahovica or its additions. Nicholas Kont was by far the most significant member of its house and one of the main aristocrats during the reign of King Louis I of Hungary (Mažuran 2008: 14–15). His sons, Bartholomew and Nicholas, did not pay much attention to the Orahovica estate which mostly stayed in the hands of their relatives, the descendants of Lőkös of Jacob, Nicholas Kont's cousin, from whom the House of Orahovica originated (Andrić, Radić 2004: 13; Andrić 2008: 85). The rule of King Sigismund was important for the development of the Orahovica area in the Late Middle Ages. Its specific nature enabled the rise of the House of Ilok and Nicholas of Ilok, the most prominent member of the family. In Nicholas' and his son Ladislaus' time, Ružica grad flourished (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 5). In that respect, it is logical to conclude that the manor house, 800 m away, was not left neglected. However, the present stage of research does not allow concrete conclusions about who built the manor house or the additions. Nicholas of Ilok's researched estates point to this magnate's large building activity.

## POVIJEST ISTRAŽIVANJA

Među velikim bogatstvom srednjovjekovnih lokaliteta koje baštini orahovički kraj možda najmanje poznat i jasan je onaj u podnožju Ružice, smješten oko 800 m sjeverno uz potok Ercegovac, kojega popis kotara Orahovice iz 1702. godine naziva *curiae nobilitaris* (Smičiklas 1891: 271). Kuri-ja se danas nalazi oko 2,5 km od centra Orahovice te se u njezinoj neposrednoj blizini nalazi kamenolom Radlovac. Izgrađena je na oko 320 m n. v. Teren se južno i jugozapadno od nje naglo uzdiže prema vrhovima Papuka, dok se sjeverno i sjeveroistočno od kurije pruža nizina. Nazvavši ju „velikom zgradom za prebivanje“, Gjuro Szabo je još prije stotinjak godina iskazao zbunjenost i nepoznanicu koja obavlja kuriju (Szabo 1914: 94). Popis orahovičkoga kotara iz 1702. godine navodi da je trgovište Orahovica za Turaka bilo znatan grad, a dijeli se na Gornju i Donju Varoš. Povrh Gornje Varoši nalazi se ruševna utvrda, a u dolinama bli-žu nje nalaze se dvije „plemičke kurije“ (Andrić 2008: 95). Szabo je pronašao i ukratko opisao jednu kuriju, ali navodi da je „sasvim iščezao trag one *curiae nobilitaris* koju je vidio popisivač iz g. 1702“ jer ju on nije uspio pronaći niti mu je tko mogao reći gdje se nalazila (Szabo 1914: 94, 99).<sup>2</sup> Općenito, neznanju pridonose i škrti spomeni kurije (ili ku-rija, kao što je vidljivo u prethodnome primjeru) u izvori-ma. U ispravama, poput one Ferdinanda Habsburgovca iz 1529. godine („utvrda Orahovica s plemićkom kurijom...“), za kuriju se saznaje kao „pratnju“ izvorima važnijoj utvrdi (Andrić 2008: 93).

## RESEARCH HISTORY

Among abundant medieval sites in the Orahovica area, the site at the foot of the Ružica grad might be the least known and poorly understood. It is situated around 800 m north, along Ercegovac Stream, and called *curiae nobilitaris* in 1702 Orahovica property list (Smičiklas 1891: 271). Today, the manor house is situated 2.5 km away from the centre of Orahovica and close to Radlovac Quarry. It was built at an altitude of 320 m a.s.l. The terrain south and south-west from the manor house steeply rises towards the peaks of Papuk Mountain, while north and north-east from the house, stretches a plain. Calling it “a large residential building” one hundred years ago, Gjuro Szabo demonstrated the confusion and mystery that surround the manor house (Szabo 1914: 94). The 1702 Orahovica property list states that the market town of Orahovica was a town of considerable size during the Ottoman rule and that it was divided into two parts – Gornja and Donja Varoš. Above Gornja Varoš, there was a dilapidated castle, while in the lowlands near it, there were two “aristocratic manor houses” (Andrić 2008: 95). Szabo found and briefly described one of the manor houses, but stated that “the trace of the *curiae nobilitaris* the registrar saw in 1702 has completely vanished”, because he was not able to find it, nor was anyone able to tell him where it had been (Szabo 1914: 94, 99).<sup>2</sup> In general, sparse mentions of the manor house (or manor houses, as the aforementioned example noted) in sources also contribute to the lack of knowledge about it. Documents, such as the one issued by Ferdinand I of Habsburg in 1529 (“castle of Orahovica with an aristocratic manor house...”), mention the manor house as an “accompaniment” to the castle which was much more important to the sources (Andrić 2008: 93).




Sl. 1 Kurija u podnožju Ružica grada (prema: Szabo 1914: 101)  
Fig. 1 Manor house beneath Ružica grad (after: Szabo 1914: 101)

<sup>2</sup> Prema Szabinom prijevodu izvor navodi: „a i u drugom se dolu nalaze taki ostanci“ (Szabo 1914: 102). Za izvor vidi Smičiklas 1891: 271.

<sup>2</sup> According to Szabo’s translation, the original states “there are also such remains in the other valley” (Szabo 1914: 102). For the source, see Smičiklas 1891: 271.

Nakon Szabinog izvještaja, kroz cijelo 20. stoljeće nije bilo značajnijih izvještaja o plemićkoj kuriji podno Ružice Grada. Čak i u monografiji „Srednjovjekovni grad Ružica“, nastaloj na istoimenom izložbenom projektu započetom 1998. godine, saznaje se samo da postoji „stambena palača ili *curia nobilitaris* u podnožju same utvrde Ružica-grada ...“ (Andrić, Radić 2004: 8). Značajan je članak Ratka Vučetića iz 2006. godine u kojem kuriju kraj Orahovice uklapa u šire istraživanje razvoja i tipologije kurija u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj. Prvi rad koji se bavi isključivo kurijom je onaj Daniela Zeca iz 2007. godine, u kojemu je iznio zatečeno stanje objekta i opisao njegove dijelove. U njemu je naglasio važnost kurije kao jednoga od rijetkih sačuvanih spomenika toga vremena, „koji ne pripada fortifikacijskoj ili sakralnoj vrsti arhitekture, već predstavlja u prostoru slobodnostojeću profanu građevinu“ (Zec 2007: 126). Iako njezina važnost nikada nije bila upitna, bila je prepuštena zubu vremena pa je, relativno nedavno, došlo do urušavanja sjevernoga zida koji je prije toga bio impresivno visoko očuvan. Veliki problem bila je činjenica da kurija nije imala status zaštićenoga kulturnog dobra sve do 30. svibnja 2006. godine, kada je stavljena pod preventivnu zaštitu rješenjem Uprave za zaštitu kulturne baštine Konzervatorskoga odjela u Požegi (Zec 2007: 126). Stanje kakvim ga je opisao Daniel Zec zadržalo se gotovo nepromijenjeno do arheoloških istraživanja 2017. godine.

After Szabo's report and throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, there were no significant reports on the manor house at the foot of the Ružica grad. Even the monograph "Medieval Town of Ružica", created on the basis of an exhibition project of the same name that started in 1998, reveals only that there is "a residential palace or *curia nobilitaris* at the foot of Ružica grad itself..." (Andrić, Radić 2004: 8). Ratko Vučetić's paper published in 2006 is significant because it includes the manor house near Orahovica in a wider study of the development and typology of manor houses in continental Croatia. The first paper dealing exclusively with the manor house was written by Daniel Zec in 2007, in which he presented the condition of the structure and described the parts comprising it. He also stressed the importance of the manor house as one of the rarely preserved monuments of that time "that does not belong to fortification or sacral architecture but represents a freestanding profane building" (Zec 2007: 126). Although its importance has never been questioned, it was left the victim of the ravages of time, and relatively recently, the northern wall has collapsed, even though it had been impressively well preserved until then. One significant problem was the fact that the manor house had not had the status of a protected cultural property until May 30, 2006, when the decision of the Conservation Department in Požega's Directorate for the Protection of Cultural Heritage put it under preventive protection (Zec 2007: 126). The condition described by Daniel Zec remained almost unaltered until the archaeological excavation in 2017.



Sl. 2 Kurija kraj Orahovice tijekom arheoloških istraživanja 2019. godine (snimio: M. Emić, 2019.)

Fig. 2 Manor house near Orahovica during the archeological excavation in 2019 (photo by: M. Emić, 2019)

## OPIS KURIJE

Kurija je orijentacije istok – zapad, s malim odstupanjem.<sup>3</sup> Sjeverni zid dugačak je 28 m, a kraći, zapadni zid, 10 m. Zidovi su u elevaciji sačuvani i do 10 m, a u relativno nedavno vrijeme došlo je do djelomičnoga urušavanja sjevernoga zida. Tragovi kvadratnih utora za drvene stropne, odnosno podne grede, ukazuju na to da je kurija bila izgrađena na visinu tri etaže (Zec 2007: 119). Kada je Szabo pisao da „sudeć po karakteru zidova, potječu iz istoga vremena kao i onaj silni gornji grad“, vjerojatno je mislio na to da su, kao i na Ružica gradu, zidovi građeni od većega i manjega priklesanog kamena (Szabo 1914: 99; Zec 2007: 119). No, za razliku od Ružice, u kuriji se pronalazi i korištenje opeke, ali i manjih kamenih oblutaka, vjerojatno dopremljenih iz obližnjega potoka. Vidljivo je pojačanje uglova zidova pravilno klesanim kamenim kvadrima većih dimenzija. Među više očuvanih prozorskih niša, na zapadnome zidu nalazi se prozorska niša segmentnoga nadvoja, građena opekom koja se stepenasto sužava u najdonjem dijelu, tvoreći s lijeve i desne strane usku klupčicu. Ovaj okvir prozora sličan je prozorskim nišama Ružice grada. Na etaži ispod nalazi

## MANOR HOUSE DESCRIPTION

The manor house is oriented in the direction of east-west, with a slight deviation.<sup>3</sup> The northern wall is 28 m long, and the shorter, western wall is 10 m long. The walls are preserved up to 10 m in elevation and relatively recently, the northern wall has partly collapsed. Traces of square grooves for wooden ceiling, i.e. floor beams, indicate that the manor house was built to the height of three floors (Zec 2007: 119). When Szabo wrote that “considering the character of the walls, they originate from the same time as the immense town on the hill”, he was probably pointing to the walls being built out of larger and smaller ashlar stones, just as the walls of Ružica grad (Szabo 1914: 99; Zec 2007: 119). But, unlike in Ružica grad, brick was used in the manor house, as well as smaller pebbles, probably from a nearby creek. There is visible reinforcement with regularly carved stone cuboids of larger dimensions on the corners. Among several preserved window niches, there is a window niche with a segmental arch in the western wall, built with brick, cascading and narrowing in the bottom part, creating a narrow window sill on the left and right. This window frame is similar to window niches of Ružica grad. The floor below has another



Sl. 3 Konzola kamina (prema: Zec 2007: 121)  
Fig. 3 Fireplace corbel (after: Zec 2007: 121)

<sup>3</sup> U ovome poglavlju donosi se sažetak detaljne povijesno-umjetničke analize kurije kraj Orahovice koju je napravio Daniel Zec (za više vidi Zec 2007). Na sreću, analiza je napravljena prije nego što se urušio dio sjevernoga zida koji je sadržavao značajne arhitektonske elemente.

<sup>3</sup> This chapter offers a summary of a detailed historical-artistic analysis of the manor house near Orahovica conducted by Daniel Zec (for more details see Zec 2007). Luckily, the analysis was conducted before the part of the northern wall containing significant architectural elements collapsed.

se još jedna niša segmentnoga oblika (Zec 2007: 119–120). Jedan od posebnih elemenata kurije kraj Orahovice nalazi se u uglu u kojemu se sastaju zapadni i južni zid. Ondje se ocrtavaju tragovi kamina (sl. 3) za čiju sačuvanu, „iz jednog komada kamena vrlo lijepo istesanu“, konzolu još Szabo navodi da je vrijedna spomena (Szabo 1914: 99). Funkcija konzole bila je podupiranje nape kamina. Ova konzola je, kako navodi Zec, „vrlo vrijedan primjer arhitektonske kamene plastike gotičko-renesansnih stilskih obilježja“ (Zec 2007: 120). Iako je jednostavno ukrašena, ona ukazuje na izvrsnu kamenoklesarsku vještinu. S-oblika je te ima geometrijske profilacije kakve su uobičajene u gotičkome oblikovanju. Iznad konzole nalazi se trag nape kamina vidljiv kao plitko istaknut potez zidanja opekom. Jednak trag nalazi se i na južnome zidu iznad konzole od koje je sačuvan samo donji dio. Napa kamina na trećoj etaži prelazi u dimnjak. Njega prepoznajemo po kanalu, odnosno plitkome stepenastom uleknuću uvučenome u zid (Zec 2007: 120–121).

Na sjevernome zidu, koji se djelomično urušio 2013. godine, nalazili su se ostaci dvaju poprečnih zidova širine oko 40 cm. Na prvoj etaži nalaze se dva uska prozora, segmentnoga, gotovo prelomljenoga luka, koji je izveden opekom položenom sjekomice. Prozorske niše imaju skošene špalete. Druga etaža sjevernoga zida bila je rastvorena s pet velikih prozorskih otvora sa segmentnim, odnosno prelomljenim nadvojem. Između druge i treće prozorske osi nalazila se mala prozorska niša s okvirom od opeke. Mala prozorska niša bila je gotovo kvadratnoga oblika sa segmentnim nadvojem, a na vanjskome dijelu zida bile su vidljive klesane kamene grede pravokutnoga okvira ovoga otvora. Jasno su se razabirale jednostavne geometrijske profilacije okvira, uklesane u grede, koje su ukazivale na to da je prozor imao skošene rubove. Daniel Zec ga datira u 15. st. (Zec 2007: 123–124). Na ovaj je prozor 1915. godine Szabo posebno ukazao navodeći da „kao da je iz doba, dok još nije bilo kasnijih velikih prozora“ (Szabo 1914: 99). Zec također naglašava da je položaj ovoga prozora neposredno iznad dvije veće prozorske niše zaista nelogičan te se slaže sa Szabom da se može pretpostaviti kako prozori nisu nastali u istome trenutku gradnje (Zec 2007: 127). Na kraju, sjeverni zid je prije urušenja bio sačuvan u visini tri etaže. Na trećoj etaži su se mogla razabrati tri znatno oštećena prozora (Zec 2007: 124).

Osim ovih zidova glavne prostorije, Zec je ukazao na postojanje sklopa dodatnih prostorija.<sup>4</sup> Rekognosciranje 2006. godine ukazalo je na zid koji se nazire uz južni zid kurije, a koji je dijelom istražen u istraživanjima 2019. godine. Drugi zid na koji je uputio je onaj sa sjeverne strane kurije. On se na sjeverni zid nadovezuje otprilike paralelno s unutarnjim poprečnim zidom. S obzirom da je položen na sloj žbuke koja prekriva vanjske zidove kurije, Zec pretpostavlja kako je ovaj zid vjerojatno dio neke dogradnje izvedene nakon izgradnje kurije. Na nekim dijelovima kurije sačuvana je žbuka koja svjedoči da je kurija bila ožbukana

niche with a segmental arch (Zec 2007: 119–120). One of the extraordinary elements of the manor house near Orahovica is situated in the corner where the western and southern walls meet. Evidence of a fireplace (Fig. 3) can be seen there. Szabo noted that its preserved “finely carved from one piece of stone” corbel is worth mentioning (Szabo 1914: 99). The function of the corbel was to support the range hood of the fireplace. This corbel was, as Zec noted, “a very valuable example of architecture stonework with Gothic and Renaissance stylistic features” (Zec 2007: 120). Although it is decorated in a simple fashion, it points to excellent stonemasonry. It is S shaped and has geometric profiling common in the Gothic style. Above the corbel, there is a trace of range hood of the fireplace, visible as a shallow stretch of bricklaying. There is the same trace on the southern wall above the corbel, only a part of which was preserved. The range hood of the fireplace turns into a chimney on the third floor. It can be recognized by a duct, i.e. a shallow cascading dent retracted into the wall (Zec 2007: 120–121).

In the northern wall, which partly collapsed in 2013, there were remains of two transverse walls, around 40 cm wide. There are two narrow windows on the first floor, having a segmental, almost pointed arch with bull headers. Window niches have bevelled frames. The second floor of the northern wall was opened up by five large window openings with segmental, i.e. pointed arches. Between the second and the third window axis, there was a small window niche with a brick frame. The small window niche was almost square, with a segmental arch; on the outside of the wall, this opening’s rectangular frame carved stone beams were visible. Simple geometric profiling of the frame, carved into the beams, was clearly visible, indicating that the window had bevelled edges. Daniel Zec dated it to the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Zec 2007: 123–124). Szabo drew special attention to this window in 1915, stating that it is “as if from the time when there were still no larger later windows” (Szabo 1914: 99). Zec also emphasized that the position of this window, directly above the two larger window niches, is really illogical, and agreed with Szabo that it can be assumed that the windows were not constructed at the same point of the building process (Zec 2007: 127). Lastly, the northern wall was preserved at the height of three floors before it collapsed. On the third floor, three considerably damaged windows could be distinguished (Zec 2007: 124).

Aside from these windows of the main room, Zec pointed to the existence of a complex of additional rooms.<sup>4</sup> The field survey conducted in 2006 revealed a wall along the southern wall of the manor house, partly excavated during the 2019 research. The other wall he pointed at was the one on the northern side of the manor house. It connects to the northern wall almost parallel with the inner transverse wall. Since it was placed on a layer of plaster, covering the outer walls of the manor house, Zec assumed that this wall was probably a part of an addition built after the original construction of the manor house. Plaster was preserved in some parts of the manor house, testifying to the manor house being covered in plaster on the outside, as well as

4 | Szabo je naglasio da su, tada vidljivi, ostaci *curiae nobilitaris* „dakako tek ostaci znatno većeg sklopa zgrada“ (Szabo 1914: 99).

4 | Szabo also emphasized that the remains of the *curiae nobilitaris* visible at that point in time “were, surely, only the remains of a significantly larger building complex” (Szabo 1914: 99).

na i izvana i iznutra. Riječ je o fino zaglađenoj žbuci u izrazito svijetlom okeru (Zec 2007: 124–125). Zanimljivo je što se na vanjskome dijelu sjevernoga zida na nekim mjestima mogu vidjeti tragovi dvaju različitih slojeva žbuke. Gornji je sloj fino zaglađen i obojen izrazito svijetlim okerom, koji prelazi u bijelu boju. Ispod njega se na nekim mjestima nazire stariji sloj žbuke, grublji i tamniji. Na nekim mjestima starijega sloja vidljive su ugravirane ravne crte koje se sijeku pod pravim kutom i na taj način tvore geometrijsku mrežu. Time se nastojala imitirati gradnja u kamenu, odnosno oponašaju se fuge pravilno klesanih kamenih kvadara. Ugravirane crte široke su 1 cm i ispunjene su svijetlim oker-bijelim pastoznim namazom (Zec 2007: 125). Ovakvo dekorativno oslikavanje zidova bilo je uobičajeno u gotičko vrijeme kada su pročelja od klesanoga kamena bila skupa. Ono se u renesansnome razdoblju razvilo u raskošniju *sgraffito* tehniku (Zec 2007: 124).

### ARHEOLOŠKA ISTRAŽIVANJA

Prilikom arheoloških istraživanja otkriveni su u konfiguraciji terena prethodno vidljivi nastavci južnoga i istočnoga zida, odnosno dio južnoga zida kurije (SJ 2) i istočni zid (SJ 3).<sup>5</sup> Na 2,5 m od spoja s istočnim zidom otkriven je prolaz s kamenim pragom u južnome zidu (SJ 2). Istočni zid kurije, koji je dokumentiran i kao SJ 5 u svome jugozapadnom dijelu, nije istražen u punoj dužini, već se nastavlja pod južni profil sonde (sl. 4). Na istočni zid kurije dograđeni su zid SJ 6 te zid SJ 10 između kojih se nalazio kanal sa žbukanom podnicom. Otkriveni su ostaci pregradnoga zida SJ 59 čiji je sjeverni dio već konzerviran. Pronađeni su i ostaci zida SJ 9, paralelni sa zidom SJ 2, koji je dograđen na istočni zid (SJ 5). Kao njegov nastavak prema zapadu pokazao se zid SJ 21. Na njega je nadovezana loše očuvana struktura SJ 42 za koju se pretpostavlja da je bila temelj zida. U zapadnome dijelu otkriven je zid SJ 35 okomit na zidove SJ 21 i SJ 2. U zapadnome dijelu zida SJ 21 nalaze se zazidani prozorski otvor ili prolaz te niša/zazidana puškarnica. Na spoj zidova SJ 21 i SJ 35 nadograđen je zid SJ 44. Na njega je s južne strane dograđen zid SJ 43, a nedaleko od toga spoja sa sjeverne strane pruža se zid SJ 49. Oko 25 m jugozapadno od zida SJ 43 pronađen je jedan zid, a u jarku oko 25 m jugoistočne od njega vidljivi su tragovi struktura. S obzirom da nijedna prostorija nije istraжена u cijelosti, a istraživanje unutrašnjosti glavne zgrade započeto je tek 2020. godine, o interpretaciji prostorija i stratigrafske slike nalazišta u ovome radu neće biti riječi. Nemogućnost sigurne interpretacije na ovome stupnju istraživanja potvrđuje i činjenica da je stratigrafska situacija u jugozapadnoj prostoriji, koja je u najvećoj mjeri istraжена, iznimno zamršena te ukazuje na vjerojatno velik broj recentnih intervencija.

### POKRETNİ NALAZI

Ovom prigodom iznose se rezultati analize stolne i kuhinjske keramike prikupljene prilikom istraživanja 2017. i 2019. godine. Izdvojeni su i proučeni dijagnostički ulomci pećnjaka te se donosi analiza numizmatičkih nalaza.

<sup>5</sup> U ovome se poglavlju ukratko iznose arhitektonski rezultati arheoloških istraživanja prema dostupnim izvještajima (Janeš 2017; 2019). Donose se i strukture otkrivene arheološkim istraživanjima 2020. godine.

the inside. This was finely smoothed plaster in a very light ochre tone (Zec 2007: 124–125). Interestingly, traces of two different layers of plaster can be noticed in some parts of the outer side of the northern wall. The top layer is finely smoothed out and coloured in a very light ochre colour turning white. Beneath it, an earlier, coarser and darker layer of plaster can be seen. In some spots of the earlier layer, straight engraved lines are visible that intersect at the right angle and create a geometric grid. This served as an imitation of building in stone, i.e. joints of regularly carved stone cuboids. The engraved lines are 1 cm wide and filled with light ochre-white impasto (Zec 2007: 125). Decorative wall painting of this type was common in the Gothic period when carved stone façades were expensive. In the Renaissance period, this turned into a more lavish *sgraffito* technique (Zec 2007: 124).


### ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATIONS

Archaeological excavations revealed the continuations of the southern and eastern wall, i.e. a part of the southern wall of the manor house (SU 2) and eastern wall (SU 3), previously visible in the terrain configuration.<sup>5</sup> A passage with a stone doorstep in the southern wall (SU 2) was discovered 2.5 m from the joint with the eastern wall. The eastern wall of the manor house, also documented as SU 5 in its south-western part, was not excavated in its full length because it continues below the southern profile of the trench (Fig. 4). Walls SU 6 and SU 10 were added to the eastern wall of the manor house, between which there was a canal with plastered floor. The remains of partition wall SU 59 were discovered, the northern part of which is already conserved. The remains of wall SU 9 were also discovered, parallel with wall SU 2, added onto the eastern wall (SU 5). Wall SU 21 turned out to be its continuation towards the west. Poorly preserved structure SU 42, thought to be the foundation of the wall, continues on it. Wall SU 35, perpendicular to walls SU 21 and SU 2, was discovered in the western part. In the western part of wall SU 21, there are a walled-up window or a passage and a niche/walled-up loophole. Wall SU 44 was built onto the joint of walls SU 21 and 35. Wall SU 43 was built on it from the southern side, and not far from that joint, on the northern side, wall SU 49 extends. A wall was discovered around 25 m south-west from wall SU 43, and in a ditch around 25 m south-east from it, there traces of structures are visible. Since none of the rooms were completely excavated, and the excavation of the main building began only in 2020, there will be no mention of room interpretation and the stratigraphic analysis of the site in this paper. The interpretation being impossible in this stage of research is confirmed by the fact that the stratigraphic situation in the south-eastern room, which is mostly excavated, is extremely complex and points to a probably high number of recent interventions.

### MOVABLE FINDS

The following part presents the results of analysis of tableware and kitchenware gathered during excavations in 2017 and 2019. It brings the results of the categorization and the study of stove tile fragments and brings the results of numismatic finds analysis.

<sup>5</sup> This chapter briefly presents the architectural results of archaeological excavations according to the available reports (Janeš 2017; 2019). It also provides structures revealed during the archaeological excavation in 2020.



Sl. 4 Tlocrt vidljivih i istraženih struktura nakon arheoloških istraživanja 2020. godine (izradila: V. Gligora; doradio: M. Emić)

Fig. 4 Floorplan of visible and excavated structures after archaeological excavation in 2020 (made by: V. Gligora; supplemented by: M. Emić)

### Kuhinjska keramika

U kuhinjsko se posuđe ubrajaju posude korištene za pripremanje jela, držanje hrane i tekućine te djelomično za posluživanje (Janeš et al. 2017: 7). U ovoj skupini brojnošću prednjače ulomci lonaca. Radi se uglavnom o loncima s izduženim vratom te istaknuto profiliranim tipovima rubova značajnima za 15. st. (Janeš 2019: 23). Također, nađeni su i ulomci blago profiliranih oboda značajnih za novovjekovno razdoblje (Janeš 2017: 26). U arheološkim istraživanjima 2017. i 2019. godine pronađeno je 56 ulomaka oboda kuhinjske keramike. Njih 57 % pronađeno je u sloju SJ 37. Sloj SJ 37 nalazio se južno od zida SJ 21, u širini oko 50 cm od zida prema jugu. Riječ je o sloju masne, kompaktne crnosive zemlje s primjesama gara, u kojemu su pronađeni i svi nalazi stolne keramike. Od ulomaka oboda kuhinjske keramike, na tablama su izdvojeni ulomci 14 posuda kojima se nastojalo potražiti analogije. Izdvojeni su po tom principu da je većina oboda koja nije uključena u analizu, po svojim karakteristikama slična obodima T. 1: 1–4 i T. 2: 1. Odnosno, spomenute se, najbolje sačuvane, obode u širem smislu može smatrati predstavnicima tipova oboda najzastupljenijih na kuriji kraj Orahovice. Posude (T. 2: 2–8; 3: 1–2) predstavljaju jedinstvene primjerke koji su zbog različitosti od

### Kitchenware

Kitchenware includes pots used for preparing and storing food and liquid and some pots used for serving (Janeš et al. 2017: 7). Fragments of pots make up the largest portion of this group. Those are mostly pots with elongated necks and pronounced profiled types of rims typical for the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Janeš 2019: 23). Fragments of slightly profiled rims typical for the early modern period were likewise discovered (Janeš 2017: 26). Archaeological excavations in 2017 and 2019 yielded 56 fragments of rims of kitchenware. Layer SU 37 yielded 57% of them. Layer SU 37 was situated south of wall SU 21, around 50 cm south of the wall. It was a layer of greasy, compact, black and grey dirt with traces of soot, in which all finds of tableware were discovered. Fragments of 14 pots of kitchenware rims are included in the plates, to which the author attempted to find analogies. Most rims not included in the analysis are similar in their characteristics to rims in Pl. 1: 1–4 and Pl. 2: 1, i.e. the aforementioned, best-preserved rims can be considered, in the broadest sense, representative of types of rims most common in the manor house near Orahovica. Pots (Pl. 2: 2–8; 3: 1–2) represent unique samples, included in the analysis due to being different from other discovered kitchenware and their analogies were attempted to be found at other sites. According to Tajana

ostatka pronađene kuhinjske keramike izdvojeni kako bi im se pokušalo pronaći analogije na drugim lokalitetima. Prema podjeli Tajane Sekelj Ivančan, na osnovi ulomaka oboda koji su dovoljno dobro sačuvani i koji su dovoljno veliki kako bi se mogao odrediti rekonstruirani promjer oboda posude, među nalazima kuhinjske keramike trenutno je najviše ulomaka oboda srednje velikih posuda (promjera oboda od 19 do 23 cm), njih 14. Slijede posude srednje veličine (promjera oboda od 14 do 19 cm), njih 13, zatim velike posude (promjera oboda od 23 do 30 cm), njih 6 te jako velike posude (promjera oboda većeg od 30 cm) ulomaka kojih su pronađena 3 primjerka. Posude male i srednje veličine korištene su u svakodnevnom životu dok su velike, a osobito jako velike, posude uglavnom korištene za skladištenje (Sekelj Ivančan 2001: 67).

U materijalu iz kasnosrednjovjekovnog naselja na lokalitetu Stari Perkovci – Debela šuma, koje nastaje u prvoj polovici 13. st. i najvjerojatnije traje do dolaska Turaka (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 40), pronalaze se analogije za dva oboda iz kurije kraj Orahovice. Jednome obodu (T. 1: 1) analogija je obod iz 3. faze naselja koja se datira u 15. i prvu polovicu 16. st. (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 303, T. 17: 149). Analogija za drugi obod (T. 1: 2) datira se u 2. fazu naselja, odnosno 14. st. (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 301, T. 9: 87). Marija Šiša-Vivek naglašava da je vrlo malo nalaza iz Debele šume kronološki osjetljivo. Zbog toga je „teško pouzdano pratiti pojavu, razvoj i prestanak izrade pojedinih tipoloških karakteristika predmeta od razvijenog kasnog srednjeg vijeka do ranog novog vijeka“ (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 41). Obodu s najviše profilacija iz kurije kraj Orahovice (T. 1: 1) analogiju pronalazimo i u 2. fazi naselja Josipovac – Selište koja se datira u drugu polovicu 16. i 17. st. (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 312, T. 63: 495). Ovaj obod također ima tanko naglašeno rebro na vratu posude. Glavna karakteristika ovoga tipa oboda naglašena je izbočenost te tendencija prema trokutastoj profilaciji donjega ruba oboda. U 2. fazi naselja Josipovac – Selište može se pronaći još varijanti ovoga tipa oboda (Šiša-Vivek 2012: T. 66: 516; 69: 545). Sličan obod pronalazi se i u 1. fazi naselja koja se datira u 15. i prvu polovicu 16. st. (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 310, T. 51: 421). Ovo je još jedan dokaz da se oblici kasnosrednjovjekovne keramike u raznim varijantama održavaju kroz duže vremensko razdoblje. Ipak, u drugoj fazi naselja Josipovac – Selište pronalazimo najviše analogija za obode iz kurije kraj Orahovice (T. 73: 567 za obod T. 2: 2 iz kurije; T. 88: 679 za obod T. 2: 8 iz kurije; T. 89: 690 za obod T. 3: 2 iz kurije) (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 314, 317–318). Analogiju obodu s najviše profilacija iz kurije kraj Orahovice (T. 1: 1), koliko se prema fotografiji može razlučiti, pronalazi se i na položaju Stara Branjevina kraj Našica. Ovaj ulomak posude datira se u 14.–15. st. (Marković et al. 2016: 130, kat. br. 281). Istom se tipu (T. 1: 1) oboda vjerojatno može pribrojiti i ulomak kasnosrednjovjekovnog lonca iz SJ 61/62 s lokaliteta Donji Miholjac – Đanovci (Tkalčec 2016a: 57). Tom tipu mogao bi se pripisati i jedan obod s Ružice grada (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 177, T. 5: 59). Autori ne nude preciznije datacije za pojedine obode s Ružice grada (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 163). Može ih se široko datirati od 14. do 17. st. Jednom obodu iz kurije kraj Orahovice (T. 1: 3)

Sekelj Ivančan's classification, based on the fragments of rims that are preserved well enough and large enough to allow for a reconstructed diameter of the rim of the pot to be made, we can determine that, at this time, most of the fragments of the kitchenware finds belong to medium-large pots (with rim diameter between 19 and 23 cm), 14 of them altogether. Medium pots are next (with rim diameter between 14 and 19 cm), 13 of them altogether, followed by large pots (with rim diameter between 23 and 30 cm), 6 of them altogether, and very large pots (with rim diameter more than 30 cm), 3 of which were discovered. Small and medium-sized pots were used in everyday life, while large and especially very large pots were mostly used for storage (Sekelj Ivančan 2001: 67).

Among the material from the late medieval settlement at the site of Stari Perkovci – Debela šuma, which was established in the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century and probably lasted until the arrival of the Ottomans (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 40), analogies can be found for two rims from the manor house near Orahovica. One rim (Pl. 1: 1) is analogous with a rim from the third phase of the settlement, dated to the 15<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 303, Pl. 17: 149). The analogy for the second rim (Pl. 1: 2) is dated to the second phase of the settlement, i.e. the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 301, Pl. 9: 87). Marija Šiša-Vivek stresses that very few finds from Debela šuma are chronologically sensitive. Due to that, it is “difficult to reliably monitor the appearance, development, and the end of production of certain typological characteristics of objects from the developed Middle Ages to the early modern period” (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 41). The analogy for the rim with the most pronounced profiling from the manor house from Orahovica (Pl. 1: 1) can be found in the second phase of the settlement of Josipovac – Selište, dated to the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> century (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 312, Pl. 63: 495). This rim also has a thin pronounced rib on the neck of the pot. The main characteristic of this type of rims are its bottom edges, which are pronouncedly protruding and show the tendency towards having triangle-shaped profiling. In the second phase of the settlement of Josipovac – Selište, more variants of this type of rim can be found (Šiša-Vivek 2012: Pl. 66: 516; 69: 545). A similar rim can be found in the first phase of the settlement, dated to the 15<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 310, Pl. 51: 421). This is another piece of evidence confirming that the types of late medieval ceramics in different variants are retained throughout a longer period. Nevertheless, we find most analogies for rims from the manor house near Orahovica in the second phase of the settlement of Josipovac – Selište (Pl. 73: 567 for rim Pl. 2: 2 from the manor house; Pl. 88: 679 for rim Pl. 2: 8 from the manor house; Pl. 89: 690 for rim Pl. 3: 2 from the manor house) (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 314, 317–318). The analogy for the rim with the most profiling from the manor house near Orahovica (Pl. 1: 1), as far as it is possible to distinguish from photos, can be found at the site of Stara Branjevina near Našice. This pot fragment is dated to the 14<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> century (Marković et al. 2016: 130, cat. no. 281). We can probably classify a fragment of a late medieval pot from SU 61/62 from the site of Donji Miholjac – Đanovci as the same type of rim (Pl. 1: 1) (Tkalčec 2016a: 57). We can assign one rim from Ružica grad to that type as well (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 177, Pl. 5: 59). The authors do not offer more precise dating for certain rims from Ružica grad (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 163). They can be dated to the period from

pronalazi se analogija među materijalom s lokaliteta Stari Perkovci – Sela (Janeš et al. 2017: 383, T. 4: 54). Materijal s lokaliteta Stari Perkovci – Sela može se uvrstiti u vremenski okvir 14. i, s oprezom, 15. st. (Janeš et al. 2017: 349).

Samo su dva ulomka oboda kuhinjske keramike jednostavnih rubova. U slučaju nalaza iz kurije kraj Orahovice, svi obodi su, osim dva jednostavna, uglavnom ravno ili koso unutra odrezanih gornjih rubova. Samo su dva ulomka rubova odrezanih prema van. Na pojedinim ulomcima oboda vidljivo je žlijebljenje gornjega ruba koje je najvjerojatnije služilo za stabiliziranje poklopca koji je išao na posudu. Ulomci su uglavnom oksidacijski pečeni s ponekim redukcijski pečenim primjerom. Faktura je uglavnom srednje gruba s većom ili manjom količinom primjese kamenčića. Dva oboda (T. 2: 8; 3: 2) fine su izrade bez primjese kamenčića, ali s primjesom tinjca. Boja ulomaka oboda jako varira. Ulomci su jako svijetlih nijansi smeđe, narančaste, sive, raznih srednje i jako tamnih nijansi smeđe te crne boje. Boje ulomaka raznolike su i unutar sloja SJ 37 koji je sadržavao najveću količinu keramike, zbog čega on ne pokazuje nikakva pravila ili uzorke koji bi se mogli popratiti po pitanju boje. Na mnogim je primjerima vidljiva promjena boje zbog gorenja te razlika u boji vanjske i unutarnje stjenke.

Na deset ulomaka oboda vidljivi su ukrasi. Na dva ulomka vidljiv je trag vodoravnoga ukrašavanja kotačićem u dva reda od kojih gornji red ne ide cijelom dužinom jednoga ulomka.<sup>6</sup> Ovaj ukras zastupljen je na još svega par ulomaka keramike. Ostalih osam ulomaka ima ukras uzanoga ili plitko žlijebljenoga snopa rijetko ili srednje gusto razmaknutih vodoravnih linija. To je ujedno i najčešći tip ukrasa na ostalim keramičkim ulomcima. Samo na jednome obodu (T. 1: 1) ukras počinje na vratu posude, dok kod ostalih oboda ukras počinje na području ramena posude. Posude ukrašavane nazubljenim kotačićem diljem Panonije mogu se pronaći u širokom razdoblju od 10. do 14. st. (Bekić 2010: 230). Primjerci iz Ružice grada, Kolođvara i Beketinci – Benteža najvjerojatnije se datiraju u 14. st. (Marković, Botić 2017: 491–492). Ovakvo ukrašavanje prisutno je na loncima s burga Vrbovca u sloju iz 13. st. te u sloju koji se datira u razdoblje 14., možda i početak 15. st. (Tkalčec 2010a: 66). S druge strane, dekoriranje pomoću kotačića zabilježeno je na Starom gradu Bariloviću isključivo tijekom kasnoga 15. i 16. st. (Krmptić 2014a: 89). Korištenje tehnike urezivanja paralelnih linija u istočnoj Hrvatskoj uglavnom se datira do 14. st. (Marković, Botić 2017: 492). Tehnike urezivanja i plitkoga žlijebljenja na loncima s Barilovića primjenjuju se tijekom kasnoga srednjeg i čitavoga novog vijeka. Najčešće je riječ o jednoj ili više vodoravnih linija ili valovnica na ramenu (Krmptić 2014a: 89). Tehnike urezivanja i plitkoga žlijebljenja zabilježene su na burgu Vrbovec na kraju 12. i početku 13. st., a postojane su i kroz 14. i početak 15. st. Na materijalu s kraja 15. st. osobito se zamjećuje prisutnost ukrašavanja ramena lonaca snopom vodoravno žlijebljenih linija koje se zadržavaju i na početku 16. st. (Tkalčec 2010a: 66–69). Ukrašavanje plitkim žlijebljenjem paralelnih vodoravnih linija prisutno je na više ulomaka kuhinjske ke-

the 14<sup>th</sup> to the 17<sup>th</sup> century. An analogy for a rim from the manor house near Orahovica (Pl. 1: 3) can be found among the material from the site of Stari Perkovci – Sela (Janeš et al. 2017: 383, Pl. 4: 54). The material discovered at the site of Stari Perkovci – Sela can be positioned within the timeframe of the 14<sup>th</sup> and, with caution, 15<sup>th</sup> century (Janeš et al. 2017: 349).

There are only two fragments of kitchenware with simple rims. In the case of the finds from the manor house near Orahovica, all rims, aside from two simple ones, have mostly straight or sloping upper edges cut on the inside. Only two fragments of the edges were cut outwards. Some rim fragments have visible groove marks on the top edge, probably used for stabilization of the lid. The fragments were mostly made in oxidation fire, with a few examples from reduction fires. The texture is mostly moderately coarse with the trace of more or fewer stones. Two rims (Pl. 2: 8; 3: 2) are finely made without traces of stones, but with the trace of mica. The colour of the fragments varies. The fragments are very light shades of brown, orange, grey, of various medium and very dark shades of brown and black. The colours of the fragments are diverse even within the layer SU 37, which contained the most pottery, due to which it does not manifest any norms or patterns regarding the colour. A change caused by burning and the difference in the colour of the inner and outer walls are visible in many fragments.

Decorations are visible on ten fragments of the rims. Two of them manifest the traces of horizontal wheel-made decorations in two rows, of which the upper row does not go entire length of one fragment.<sup>6</sup> This type of decoration can be found in only a few more pieces of ceramics. The other eight fragments have a decoration in the shape of an incised or shallow grooved bundle of sparse or intermediately dense horizontal lines. It is the most common type of decoration in other ceramic fragments as well. Only one rim (Pl. 1: 1) has a decoration starting at the neck of the pot, while other rims have decorations starting at their shoulders. Wheel-decorated pots can be found all across Pannonia during a long period between the 10<sup>th</sup> and the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Bekić 2010: 230). Ružica grad, Kolođvar, and Beketinci specimens most probably date from the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Marković, Botić 2017: 491–492). This type of decoration is present in pots from the burg Vrbovec in the layer from the 13<sup>th</sup> century and the layer dated to the 14<sup>th</sup>, or maybe even the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Tkalčec 2010a: 66). On the other hand, wheel-made decorations were recorded at the Stari grad Barilović exclusively during the late 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries (Krmptić 2014a: 89). The use of the technique of incising parallel lines in eastern Croatia is mostly dated to the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Marković, Botić 2017: 492). Incisions and shallow groove techniques on pots from Barilović were used during the Late Middle Ages and throughout the early modern period. Mostly, there were one or more horizontal or wavy lines at the shoulder (Krmptić 2014a: 89). Incisions and shallow groove techniques were recorded at the burg Vrbovec at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century and were common during the 14<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. The material from the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century especially exhibits the decorations in the shape of a bundle of horizontal grooved lines at the shoulder of the pot, which were retained at the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century as well (Tkalčec 2010a: 66–69). Shallow parallel horizontal grooved lines are present

6 Prestajanje jednoga reda ukrasa kotačića vidljivo je i na fragmentu pronađenom na lokalitetu Breznica Našička – Netovo (vidi Marković, Botić 2017: 493).


6 The end of one tier of wheel-made decoration is also visible on the fragment discovered at the site of Breznica Našička – Netovo (see Marković, Botić 2017: 493).

ramike pronađene u sloju SJ 37 iz kurije kraj Orahovice koji je novcem datiran najranije u 1430. godinu.

### Stolna keramika

U stolnu keramiku ubrajaju se keramički predmeti korišteni za posluživanje te konzumiranje hrane ili pića (Janeš et al. 2017: 351). Među nalazima stolne keramike, iz arheoloških istraživanja 2017. i 2019. godine, izdvaja se 18 ulomaka oboda i jedan ulomak dna. Minimalan broj posuda je deset. Svi ulomci oboda stolne keramike pronađeni su u prethodno opisanome sloju SJ 37.

Pronađeno je nekoliko ulomaka čaše crveno-smeđe boje, zaobljenoga suženog oboda te jednostavnog zaravnjenoga ruba, grube fature s primjesama drobljenih kamenčića (T. 3: 3; sl. 5). Čaša je ukrašena plitkim paralelnim vodoravnim žlijebljenjem, a promjer rekonstruiranoga oboda iznosi 12 cm. Analogija ovome obodu pronalazi se u materijalu iz 1. faze naselja Josipovac – Selište koja se datira u 15. i prvu polovicu 16. st. (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 319, T. 95: 741). Dva ulomka oboda posude napravljena su od fino pročišćene kaolinske gline bijele boje (Janeš 2019: 25). Riječ je o lončiću ili čaši ukrašenom s dva odvojena niza urezanih vodoravnih linija (T. 3: 4; sl. 6). Rub je izvučen prema van, s blago profiliranim žlijebom s unutarnje strane. Rekonstruirani promjer oboda iznosi 10 cm.



Sl. 5 Ulomci čaše crveno-smeđe boje (snimio: M. Emić)  
Fig. 5 Fragments of red-brown cup (photo by: M. Emić)

Više ulomaka pripada posudi grube fature s primjesama kamenčića, svijetlo smeđe boje sa sivim i tamno smeđim mrljama (T. 3: 5; sl. 7). Rub je blago izvučen prema van, a tijelo je ukrašeno velikim brojem plitko žlijebljenih vodoravnih linija. Rekonstruirani promjer oboda iznosi 10 cm. Analogija ovome obodu pronalazi se u 1. fazi naselja Josipovac – Selište koja se datira u 15. i prvu polovicu 16. st. (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 322, T. 108: 836). Pronađeno je više ulomaka čaše na nozi (T. 3: 6; sl. 8). Noga nije sačuvana u cijelosti, ali se može zaključiti da je riječ o niskoj nozi prstenasto izvu-

on multiple fragments of kitchenware discovered in layer SU 37 from the manor house near Orahovica, which was dated by coins to 1430, the earliest.

### Tableware

Tableware includes ceramic objects used for serving and consuming food or drink (Janeš et al. 2017: 351). Among the tableware finds discovered during excavations in 2017 and 2019, 18 rim fragments and one bottom fragment stand out. The minimal number of pots is ten. All tableware rim fragments were discovered in layer SU 37 described above.

Several fragments of a red-brown cup with rounded narrowed rim and simple flatted edge were discovered, with coarse texture including traces of crushed stones (Pl. 3: 3; Fig. 5). The cup is decorated with shallow parallel horizontal grooves, and the diameter of the reconstructed rim is 12 cm. Analogy to this rim can be found in the material from the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the settlement of Josipovac – Selište, dated to the 15<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 319, Pl. 95: 741). Two pot rim fragments were made of finely purified white kaolin clay (Janeš 2019: 25). They were part of a small pot or a cup decorated with two separate sequences of incised horizontal lines (Pl. 3: 4; Fig. 6). The edge is outwardly drawn, with a slightly profiled groove on the inside. The reconstructed diameter of the rim is 10 cm.



Sl. 6 Ulomci posude od fino pročišćene kaolinske gline bijele boje (snimio: M. Emić)  
Fig. 6 Fragments of a pot made of finely purified white kaoline clay (photo by: M. Emić)

More fragments belong to a pot with coarse texture and traces of stones, light brown in colour and with grey and dark brown stains (Pl. 3: 5; Fig. 7). Its edge is slightly drawn outwards and the body is decorated with a large number of shallow horizontal grooves. The reconstructed diameter of the rim is 10 cm. An analogy for this rim can be found in the first phase of the settlement of Josipovac – Selište, dated to the 15<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 322, Pl. 108: 836). Several fragments of a cup with a foot were discovered (Pl. 3: 6; Fig. 8). The foot was not entirely preserved, but we can presume that it was low with an everted ring-shaped base. The vessel was made of white clay and had intermediately coarse texture with traces of crushed stones. The edge is slightly drawn



Sl. 7 Ulomci posude grube fature smeđe boje (snimio: M. Emić)  
Fig. 7 Fragments of brown pot with coarse texture (photo by: M. Emić)

čenoga dna. Posuda je napravljena od bijele gline srednje grube fature s primjesama drobljenih kamenčića. Rub je blago izvučen prema van, a ukrašena je plitko žlijebljenom trakom na vratu te široko razmaknutim tankim urezanim vodoravnim linijama na trbuhu. Rekonstruirani promjer oboda iznosi 8 cm.

Četiri manja ulomka oboda fine su fature, različitih nijansi žuto-smeđe, odnosno svijetlo smeđe boje. Obod jednoga ulomka oštro je izvučen, dok je rub okomito izveden (T. 3: 7; sl. 9). Rekonstruirani promjer oboda iznosi 9 cm. Analogija mu je jedna posuda s lokaliteta Stari Perkovci – Debela šuma koja pripada 3. fazi naselja i datira se u 15. i prvu polovicu 16. st. (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 309, T. 48: 391). Ovome obodu (T. 3: 7) slični su ulomci oboda još dviju posuda (T. 3: 8–9). Obodi tih posuda oštro su izvučeni s ravno odrezanim rubom i profiliranim žlijebom na unutarnjoj strani. Rekonstruirani promjeri oboda iznose 10 cm. Jednome od ulomaka oboda (T. 3: 8) analogija je posuda pronađena u kasnosrednjovjekovnoj Budi koja se datira u drugu polovicu 15. st. (Holl 2005: 324, sl. 9: 8). Kao i kod prethodno navedenih oboda, obod jedne posude (T. 3: 10) oštro je izvučen, ali je više polegnut te mu ukras počinje bliže vratu. Rekonstruirani promjer oboda iznosi 12 cm. Pronađena su dva ulomka oboda vrča s dijelom sačuvanim vratom (T. 3: 11; sl. 10). Vrč je fine fature, svijetlo smeđe boje. Kratkog je vrata na kojemu je vidljiv dio ukrasa žlijebljene vodoravne linije. Promjer rekonstruiranoga oboda iznosi 8 cm. Obod ovoga vrča sličan je obodu cjelovite sačuvane boce iz Beketinaca (Minichreiter, Marković 2013: 283, T. 41: 1) te ulomku oboda boce iz Ružice grada (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 186, kat. br. 359). Po izvedbi oboda sličan mu je vrč s lokaliteta Josipovac – Selište koji pripada 1. fazi naselja i datira se u 15. i prvu polovicu 16. st. (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 321, T. 107: 828). Sličnost pokazuje i jedan primjerak s lokaliteta



Sl. 8 Ulomci čaše na nozi (snimio: M. Emić)  
Fig. 8 Fragments of cup with a foot (photo by: M. Emić)

outwards and the vessel is decorated with a shallow grooved band at the neck and widely spaced thin incised horizontal lines at the belly. The reconstructed diameter of the rim is 8 cm.

Four smaller rim fragments have fine texture and are of various shades of yellow-brown, i.e. light brown colour. Rim of one fragment is sharply drawn, while the edge is perpendicular (Pl. 3: 7; Fig. 9). The reconstructed diameter of the rim is 9 cm. An analogy for the rim can be found in a pot from the site of Stari Perkovci – Debela šuma, belonging to the third phase of the settlement, dated to the 15<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 309, Pl. 48: 391). There are rim fragments of two more pots (Pl. 3: 8–9) similar to this rim (Pl. 3: 7). The rims of those pots are sharply drawn and have straight edges and a profiled groove on the inside. The reconstructed rim diameters are 10 cm. One rim fragment (Pl. 3: 8) analogy was discovered in late medieval Buda, dated to the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Holl 2005: 324, Fig. 9: 8). As in the aforementioned rims, the rim of one of the pots (Pl. 3: 10) is sharply drawn, but it is less perpendicular, and the decoration begins closer to the neck. The reconstructed rim diameter is 12 cm. Two pitcher rim fragments were discovered with a partially preserved neck (Pl. 3: 11; Fig. 10). The pitcher is light brown and has fine texture. It has a short neck with a visible part of a grooved horizontal line decoration. The reconstructed rim diameter is 8 cm. The rim of this pitcher is similar to the rim of an entirely preserved bottle from Beketinci (Minichreiter, Marković 2013: 283, Pl. 41: 1) and the bottle rim fragment from Ružica grad (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 186, cat. no. 359). Pitcher from the site of Josipovac – Selište, belonging to the first phase of the settlement and dated to the 15<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century is similar to this pitcher in the execution of the rim (Šiša-Vivek 2012: 321, Pl. 107: 828). A fragment from the site of Našice – Klara also shows some similarity (Mažuran 1956: Pl. 7: 3). Ceramics discovered at the assumed monastery of the Order of Saint Clare is dated by




Sl. 9 Ulomak oboda fine fature svijetlosmeđe boje (snimio: M. Emić)

Fig. 9 Fragment of a light brown rim with fine texture (photo by: M. Emić)

Našice – Klara (Mažuran 1956: T. 7: 3). Keramiku pronađenu na pretpostavljenome mjestu samostana svete Klare Mažuran datira u konac 14. i 15. st. (Mažuran 1956: 117).

Za kraj još treba spomenuti važan nalaz dna zeleno glazirane čaše (T. 3: 12; sl. 11). Dno je ukrašeno romboidnim motivom, a promjera je 5 cm. S obzirom na to da je riječ o jednostavno izvedenome dnu, u nedostatku oboda, nije moguće govoriti o mogućim analogijama. Za sada ga se jedino može opisati kao dio gotičke čaše. Gotičke čaše upotrebljavali su bogatiji pojedinci te se obraćala veća pozornost njihovome ukrašavanju (Tkalčec 2001: 214). Trenutno ne postoji tipologija keramičkih čaša na području Hrvatske, stoga ju se s oprezom može proučiti u kontekstu keramičkih čaša s područja Slovenije. Mitja Guštin je keramičke čaše na području Slovenije u razdoblju od kraja 14. do prve polovice 16. st. podijelio na četiri velike skupine (Guštin 2001: 142–143). Prema toj bi se podijeli dno zeleno glazirane čaše (T. 3: 10), s lagano konično oblikovanim stjenkama, moglo pripisati prvome tipu, odnosno jednostavnim čašama (Šimek 2012: 191; Matijević 2013: 62). Ipak, jednostavne čaše su grublje izrade. Prema kvaliteti izrade ova čaša više podsjeća na tzv. celjske čaše koje su kvalitetne izrade i bo-



Sl. 10 Ulomci boce fine fature svijetlosmeđe boje (snimio: M. Emić)

Fig. 10 Fragments of light brown bottle with fine texture (photo by: M. Emić)

Mažuran to the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Mažuran 1956: 117).

Finally, the important find of the bottom of a green glazed cup should be mentioned (Pl. 3: 12; Fig. 11). The bottom is decorated with a rhombic motif and has a diameter of 5 cm. Since this is a simply executed bottom and there is no rim, we cannot draw any analogies. For now, we can only describe it as a part of a Gothic cup. Gothic cups were used by better-off individuals and greater attention was given to the way they were decorated (Tkalčec 2001: 214). Currently, typology of ceramic cups in Croatia does not exist, therefore, it can only be cautiously studied in the context of ceramic cups from Slovenia. Mitja Guštin classified ceramic cups in Slovenia from the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> to the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century into four large groups (Guštin 2001: 142–143). With regards to that classification, the bottom of the green glazed cup (Pl. 3: 10), with slightly conically shaped walls, could be assigned to the first type, i.e. to simple cups (Šimek 2012: 191; Matijević 2013: 62). Nevertheless, simple cups are coarsely executed. According to its production quality, this cup is more reminiscent of the so-called Celje-type cups, of high-quality production and elaborately decorated. Celje-type cups are most commonly dated to the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Guštin 2001: 143, 63, 158).

The discovering of several decorated fragments of ceramic has to be emphasized. Four fragments are coated in fine olive green glaze on the outside. A small fragment of maiolica was also discovered (Fig. 12). It was found in layer SU 37, currently dated by the finds of tableware and Sigismund of Luxembourg's coin, more of which will be said later on in the text. Two extremely small fragments of ceramics have traces of being painted red, while two larger fragments, probably belonging to a pitcher, exhibit decorations of a painted grid motif – one in standard red, and the other in brown colour (Fig. 13). Finds of this type of pitchers appear in Hungary from the 13<sup>th</sup> century, and the shape remained throughout the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Holl 2005: 321). There are known pitchers painted red in the area of Czechia and Moravia throughout a long period, from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century (Bikić 2003: 114–115). Painting in red colour was common during the 15<sup>th</sup> century in Buda and other production centres of the central European cultural circle (Krmpotić 2014a:



Sl. 11 Ulomak dna zeleno glazirane čaše (snimio: M. Emić)

Fig. 11 Fragment of the bottom of a green glazed cup (photo by: M. Emić)

gato su ukrašene. Celjske čaše se najčešće datira u kraj 14. te 15. st. (Guštin 2001: 143, 63, 158).

Treba naglasiti nekoliko ukrašenih ulomaka keramike. Četiri ulomka izvana su prevučena finom maslinastom glazurom. Pronađen je i maleni ulomak majolike (sl. 12). Nalazio se u sloju SJ 37 koji se trenutno datira prema nalazima stolne keramike i novca Žigmunda Luksemburškog, o čemu više u nastavku teksta. Dva iznimno mala ulomka keramike imaju tragove crvenoga slikanja, dok dva veća ulomka, koji su najvjerojatnije bili dio vrča, pokazuju ukras slikanoga mrežastog motiva – jedan u standardnoj crvenoj, a drugi u smeđoj boji (sl. 13). Nalazi ovoga tipa vrča pojavljuju se u Ugarskoj od 13. st., a oblik se zadržao i kroz 14. st. (Holl 2005: 321). Crveno slikani vrčevi su poznati na području Češke i Moravske u dugome razdoblju, od 13. do početka 17. st. (Bikić 2003: 114–115). Slikanje crvenom bojom zastupljeno je tijekom 15. st. u Budimu te drugim proizvodnim središtima srednjoeuropskoga kulturnog kruga (Krpmotić 2014a: 81) te se najveća proizvodnja slikanih vrčeva smješta u razdoblje druge polovice 15. st. (Bikić 2003: 161). Oslikavanje crvenom bojom bila je dominantna tehnika ukrašavanja neglaziranih vrčeva na srednjoeuropskome prostoru i tijekom 16. i 17. st. (Krpmotić 2014a: 82). Uglavnom, nalazi crveno slikane keramike poznati su u srednjem vijeku na prostoru Ugarske, Slavonije te u susjednim zonama pod ugarskim utjecajem (Janeš et al. 2017: 352). Crvenom bojom ukrašen je istim ukrasom i jedan ulomak vrča s Ružice grada (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 188, kat. br. 363). Slikanje mrežastim motivom može se pronaći na lokalitetima Stari Perkovci – Sela, Stari Perkovci – Debeli šuma, Verušed, Josipovac – Selište, Beketinci – Bentež, Franjevac, Našice – Klara, Našice – Građa, dva nepoznata lokaliteta u Našicama i brojni drugi.<sup>7</sup>

Sve u svemu, u slučaju keramičkih nalaza iz kurije kraj Orahovica potvrđuje se pravilo da se arheologija kasnoga srednjeg vijeka najmanje od svih drugih arheoloških razdoblja može oslanjati na tipološku kronologiju kuhinjske keramike u razdoblju srednjega vijeka. Mnogi se oblici du-




Sl. 12 Ulomak glaziranoga tanjura ili zdjele (snimio: M. Emić)  
Fig. 12 Fragment of a glazed plate or bowl (photo by: M. Emić)

<sup>7</sup> Mnogi su lokaliteti u Slavoniji na kojima se nalazi slikano posuđe. Zorko Marković i Katarina Botić smatraju da postoji mogućnost da se na području Našica, zbog velike količine bojanoga posuđa pronađenoga na užem području, nalazio jedan ili više centara proizvodnje (Marković, Botić 2017: 493).

81). Most painted pitchers are thought to have been produced in the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Bikić 2003: 161). Painting unglazed pitchers red was the dominant decoration technique in the area of Central Europe during the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century as well (Krpmotić 2014a: 82). Familiar medieval finds of ceramics painted red were discovered in Hungary, Slavonia, and the neighbouring zones under Hungarian influences (Janeš et al. 2017: 352). There was also one pitcher fragment from Ružica grad decorated in red paint and the same ornament (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 188, cat. no. 363). Painting in grid-motif can be found at the sites of Stari Perkovci – Sela, Stari Perkovci – Debeli šuma, Verušed, Josipovac – Selište, Beketinci – Bentež, Franjevac, Našice – Klara, Našice – Građa, two unknown sites in Našice and many other sites.<sup>7</sup>

All in all, the case of ceramic finds from the manor house near Orahovica confirms the rule that the archaeology of the Late Middle Ages can least of all other archaeological periods rely on the typological chronology of kitchenware in the Middle Ages. Many forms remain in use over a long time, due to which they are not typologically sensitive – basic forms span several centuries (Tkalčec 2010b: 457). Due to that, similar forms and types can be found at various sites in Slavonia that do not differ from the ones from the manor house near Orahovica in many points, but finding precise analogies, as can be seen in the analysis, is extremely rare. It was decided not to mention these similar specimens, of which there are many due to the typological similarity of ceramics in the narrow region, because a multiple increase in the number of approximate analogies would lead to the loss of precision and the clarity of distribution of precise analogies. Fewer precise analogies point to a significant local material specificity, while found analogies testify to the lack of the aforementioned chronological sensitivity of typology of kitchenware rims – they are dated to the long period from the 14<sup>th</sup> to the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Rare analogies, which are found on the same principle for tableware, point to the shorter period of the 15<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Tableware points to the presence



Sl. 13 Dva ulomka keramike s ukrasom slikanoga mrežastog motiva (snimio: M. Emić)  
Fig. 13 Two fragments of ceramic with decoration in painted grid-motif (photo by: M. Emić)

<sup>7</sup> Painted dishware was discovered at many sites in Slavonia. Zorko Marković and Katarina Botić think that there is a possibility that there were one or more production centres in Našice area, due to a large amount of painted dishware discovered in the vicinity (Marković, Botić 2017: 493).

go zadržavaju u upotrebi zbog čega nisu tipološki osjetljivi – osnovne forme provlače se kroz nekoliko stoljeća (Tkalčec 2010b: 457). Zbog toga je na raznim lokalitetima u Slavoniji moguće pronaći slične oblike i tipove koji se od onih iz kurije kraj Orahovice ne razlikuju u puno točaka, ali je pronalazak preciznih analogija, kao što je u analizi vidljivo, iznimno rijedak slučaj. Te slične primjerke, kojih je zbog tipološke sličnosti keramike na užem regionalnom prostoru puno, odlučeno je ne navoditi jer bi se višestrukim porastom okvirnih analogija izgubila preciznost i jasnoća rasprostranjenosti preciznih analogija. Manji broj preciznih analogija ukazuje na veću lokalnu specifičnost materijala, dok pronađene analogije svjedoče prethodno navedenoj kronološkoj neosjetljivosti tipologije oboda kuhinjske keramike – datiraju se u široko razdoblje od 14. do 17. st. Rijetke analogije koje su po istom principu pronađene za stolnu keramiku ukazuju na uže vremensko razdoblje 15. i prve polovice 16. st. Stolna keramika ukazuje na prisustvo plemstva u kuriji čime povezuje nalaze arheoloških istraživanja s povijesnom ulogom kurije koja je poznata kod ovakvih zdanja.

### Pećnjaci

Najveću količinu pokretnih nalaza prikupljenih arheološkim istraživanjima kurije čine pećnjaci. Samo 2019. godine pronađeno je 163 ulomaka oboda pećnjaka. Njih 87 % pronađeno je u sloju SJ 34. Riječ je o sloju crvenkasto-smeđe zemlje prošaranome komadićima opeke i gara. Sloj SJ 34 prostirao se većim dijelom površine prostorije omeđene zidovima SJ 2, SJ 35, SJ 21 te strukturom SJ 42. Djelomično je prekrivao i ostatke zida SJ 2, što ukazuje na to da je nastao nakon devastacije južnoga zida glavne zgrade kurije (SJ 2). Prema tipologiji Ivane Škiljan, većinu pećnjaka pronađenih prilikom istraživanja kurije kraj Orahovice može se svrstati u jednostavne, odnosno čašaste i lukovičaste pećnjake (Škiljan 2015: 42). Otvori ovih pećnjaka izvedeni su različitim obodima.<sup>8</sup> Zbog jednostavnosti oblika nemaju datacijsku vrijednost te ih se, s obzirom na način pečenja, većinu može datirati u razdoblje ranoga novog vijeka (Janeš 2019: 27). Pronađena su i dva fragmenta zdjelastih pećnjaka. Među jednostavnim pećnjacima ističu se dva ulomka pećnjaka s oker-smeđe glaziranom reljefnom dekoracijom dna (sl. 14). Specifičan je pronalazak ulomka iznutra smeđe glaziranog pećnjaka četverolisnoga ili trolisnoga otvora.<sup>9</sup>

Od 14. i posebice 15. st. pećnjaci se počinju prevlačiti pigmentiranom olovnom glazurom, uglavnom zelene, žute ili smeđe boje (Krpmotić 2014b: 93). Pećnjaci se rano razvijaju od strogo funkcionalnih oblika do pećnjaka s prednjom pločom koja je reljefno ukrašena i glazirana, pa već u 14. st. postaju proizvod primijenjene umjetnosti (Škiljan

of aristocracy in the manor house, connecting the finds of archaeological excavations with the historical role of manor houses such as this one.

### Stove tiles

Stove tiles make up the largest portion of movable finds gathered during archaeological excavations of the manor house. Only in 2019, 163 fragments of stove tile rims were discovered. Layer SU 34 yielded 87 % of them. It is a layer of red-brown soil, mixed with pieces of bricks and soot. Layer SU 34 spread through most of the room bounded by walls SU 2, SU 35, SU 21, and the structure SU 42. It partly covered the remains of wall SU 2, indicating that it appeared after the devastation of the southern wall of the main building of the manor house (SU 2). According to Ivana Škiljan's typology, most stove tiles discovered during the excavation of the manor house near Orahovica can be classified as simple, i.e. cup-shaped and bulb-shaped tiles (Škiljan 2015: 42). Openings of these tiles are executed in differently shaped rims.<sup>8</sup> Due to the simplicity of shape, they do not help with dating and, given the way they were made, most can be dated to the early modern period (Janeš 2019: 27). Two fragments of bowl-shaped tiles were also discovered. Two tile fragments with ochre-brown glazed relief decoration of the bottom stand out among the simple tiles (Fig. 14). A find of a fragment of a tile glazed in brown on the inside with an opening in the shape of a four-leaf or trefoil opening is specific.<sup>9</sup>



Sl. 14 Dva ulomka pećnjaka s oker-smeđe glaziranom reljefnom dekoracijom dna (snimio: M. Emić)

Fig. 14 Two fragments of stove tile with ochre-brown glazed relief decoration of the bottom (photo by: M. Emić)

From the 14<sup>th</sup> and especially 15<sup>th</sup> century, stove tiles were being coated in pigmented lead glaze, mostly green, yellow or brown in colour (Krpmotić 2014b: 93). Early on, stove tiles


8 Ovim putem zahvaljujem Andreju Janešu i Petru Sekuliću na uvidu u još neobjavljeni rad pod nazivom *Keramički i metalni nalazi iz samostana sv. Petra na Zlatu*, koji mi je omogućio bolje razumijevanje čašastih i lukovičastih pećnjaka.

9 Primjer trolisnoga pećnjaka pronađen je na Ružica gradu (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 233, kat. br. 482).

8 I would like to thank Andrej Janeš and Petar Sekulić for the insight into their unpublished paper titled *Keramički i metalni nalazi iz samostana sv. Petra na Zlatu*, which enabled me to understand cup-shaped and bulb-shaped tiles better.

9 A sample of a trefoil tile was discovered at Ružica grad (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 233, cat. no. 482).

2011: 161). Tako je u Europi već do polovice 14. st. započela proizvodnja pećnjaka s ravnom prednjom ukrasnom pločom (Škiljan 2017: 55). Među nekolicinom pronađenih zeleno glaziranih pećnjaka ističu se sljedeći primjeri. Tri ulomka pećnjaka imaju prednju dekorativnu ploču ukrašenu rozetama (sl. 15). Dva ulomka ukrašena su vegetabilnom dekoracijom i viticama (sl. 16). Na jednome od njih vidljiv je motiv vinove loze, odnosno grozda. Pronađen je ulomak pećnjaka sa stražnjom stranom trokutaste forme, što ukazuje na mogućnost da je bio dio kruništa peći (Škiljan 2015: 80).<sup>10</sup> Zanimljiv je i ulomak koji je vjerojatno bio dio perforirane prednje ploče pećnjaka s nišom (sl. 17). Karakterizira ga mali oštri istak vidljiv na brojnim pećnjacima na području srednjovjekovne Ugarske.<sup>11</sup>



Sl. 15 Tri ulomka pećnjaka ukrašena rozetama (snimio: M. Emić)  
Fig. 15 Three fragments of stove tile decorated with rosettes (photo by: M. Emić)



Sl. 16 Dva ulomka pećnjaka ukrašena vegetabilnom dekoracijom (snimio: M. Emić)  
Fig. 16 Two fragments of stove tiles decorated with plant decoration (photo by: M. Emić)

10 Krak trokuta blago je zaobljen što ukazuje na mogućnost da je riječ o sedlastome pećnjaku (primjer u Horvat 1994: 230) ili nekome drugom obliku.

11 Formom je sličan nekim primjerima s Ružice grada (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 302, kat. br. 628; 256, kat. br. 538). Sličan oblik zastupljen je i na raznim poznatim nalazištima pećnjaka poput kraljevske palače u Budi (Holl 1958: 236, sl. 42), u Segedinu (Szatmari 1985: 77, T. 11: 5) i drugdje. Ovim se primjerima nastojalo prikazati sličnost izvedbe na širem području, koja, bez reprezentativnijih izvedbi, onemogućava stvaranje preciznih poveznica.

turned from strictly functional tiles into glazed tiles with faces decorated in relief, becoming an applied art product as early as the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Škiljan 2011: 161). Thus, by the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the production of stove tiles with flat ornamental face had already started in Europe (Škiljan 2017: 55). The following examples stand out among the few discovered green glazed stove tiles. Three fragments of stove tiles have the ornamental face decorated with rosettes (Fig. 15). Two fragments were decorated with plant ornaments and tendrils (Fig. 16). One of them has a visible grapevine, i.e. grape motif. A fragment of a stove tile with a triangular backside was discovered, indicating that it might have been a part of the crown of a stove (Škiljan 2015: 80).<sup>10</sup> A fragment that was probably a part of the perforated face of the stove tile with a niche is also interesting (Fig. 17). It is characterized by a small sharp protrusion visible in many stove tiles in the area of medieval Hungary.<sup>11</sup>

The fragment of a green glazed plate-shaped stove tile which includes a part of a wing, a leg, and a part of a tail of a double-headed eagle in a shield (Fig. 18) is the most interesting tile. Stylistically, the execution of the eagle is similar to the execution of the stove tile from Ružica grad dated to the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>12</sup> Images of the heraldic eagle in relief are a common motif on late Gothic stove tiles. They appear from Sigismund's period, and from the 16<sup>th</sup> century onwards, the double-headed Habsburg eagle appears almost regularly on stove tiles (Škiljan 2015: 166). There is another fragment



Sl. 17 Ulomak perforiranoga pećnjaka (snimio: M. Emić)  
Fig. 17 Fragment of a perforated stove tile (photo by: M. Emić)

10 A prong of the triangle is slightly rounded, pointing to the possibility that it was saddle-shaped (see example in Horvat 1994: 230) or of some other shape.

11 It is similar in form to some samples from Ružica grad (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 302, cat. no. 628; 256, cat. no. 538). A similar shape was present at various known sites with stove tile finds, such as the royal palace in Buda (Holl 1958: 236, Fig. 42), Szeged (Szatmari 1985: 77, Pl. 11: 5), and elsewhere. These examples were used to show similarities in production in a wider area, which, without representative executions, prevents the creation of precise links.

12 The execution of the wings, leg, and tail is somewhat similar to the execution of the (reconstructed) unglazed stove tile with the image of a crowned double-headed eagle discovered at Ružica grad (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 239, cat. no. 497).



Sl. 18 Ulomak pećnjaka ukrašen motivom dvoglavoga orla (snimio: M. Emić)

Fig. 18 Fragments of a stove tile decorated with double-headed eagle motif (photo by: M. Emić)

Najzanimljiviji je ulomak zeleno glaziranoga pločastog pećnjaka koji sadrži dio krila, nogu te dio repa dvoglavog orla u štitu (sl. 18). Stilistički, izrada orla slična je izradi na pećnjaku s Ružice grada koji se datira u prvu polovicu 15. st.<sup>12</sup> Reljefni prikazi heraldičkoga orla čest su motiv na kasnogotičkim pećnjacima. Javljaju se od Žigmundovog razdoblja, a u periodu od 16. st. nadalje habsburški se dvoglav orao gotovo redovito javlja na pečarskim proizvodima (Škiljan 2015: 166). Još je jedan ulomak glaziranoga pećnjaka s motivom životinje. Treba spomenuti i mali reljefno ukrašeni ulomak svijetlo zelene glazure koji je vjerojatno bio dio jednoga od pećnjaka vijenca peći (sl. 19). Vidljiva je izmjena tri reda različitih perforiranih ukrasa – okomitoga i vodoravnoga ovalnog te romboidnog motiva. Mali ulomak jednoga smeđe glaziranog perforiranog pećnjaka vjerojatno je također bio dio kruništa peći. Važno je naglasiti da više neuspjelih komada pronađenih na Ružica gradu svjedoče o mogućem postojanju značajne radionice u samome gradu koja se iskušala u proizvodnji i najzahtjevnijih pećnjaka (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 49). Neke od ulomaka, poput ulomka s prikazom orla, možda se može pripisati lokalnoj

12 Način izvedbe krila, noge i repa u određenoj je mjeri sličan načinu izvedbe na (rekonstruiranom) necakljenom pećnjaku s prikazom okrunjenoga dvoglavog orla pronađenom na Ružica gradu (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 239, kat. br. 497).



Sl. 19 Ulomak pećnjaka ukrašen izmjenom perforiranih ukrasa (snimio: M. Emić)

Fig. 19 Fragment of a stove tile with alternating perforated decorations (photo by: M. Emić)

of a glazed stove tile with an animal motif. A small fragment with a relief ornament and green glaze, probably a part of the stove tiles on the stove's cornice should also be mentioned (Fig. 19). Three rows of different perforated ornaments are visible – of perpendicular, horizontal oval and rhombic motif. A small fragment of a brown glazed perforated stove tile was probably also a part of the crown of the stove. It is important to emphasize that multiple unsuccessful pieces discovered at Ružica grad testify to a possible significant workshop in the town itself, trying to produce even the most complex stove tiles (Radić, Bojčić 2004: 49). Some of the fragments, such as the one with the image of an eagle, might perhaps be assigned to local production.<sup>13</sup> Aside from the local production, further research, as is the case in Ilok, which was owned by the same family as Orahovica throughout most of the observed period, could point not only to regional trade but to a connection with powerful centres of trade and economy (Tomičić 2004: 146).

### Coins

There are three significant numismatic finds discovered during the archaeological excavation in 2019.<sup>14</sup> A silver denar (SF 6) was discovered, probably Hungarian. It is quite damaged and worn out, but a coat of arms can be recognized on the obverse and a part of a cross on the reverse. It can be approximately dated to the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> or the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. For one sample (SF 9), it is difficult to establish whether it is a silver denar or *quarting*. It is probably Hungarian, and the ware makes the image on the obverse impossible to recognize. The reverse contains a patriarchal cross with a mark. It is also approximately dated to the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> or the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. One find is preserved well enough for precise dating. A silver *quarting* (SF 1) is the most significant find discovered in 2019. Although it is difficult to determine due to ware, the obverse probably contains a crown, and the reverse has a patriarchal cross with a mark between

13 Local production can be recognized by poorly executed motifs, simplification of images, loss of detail, etc. (Tkalčec 2010a: 77). The fragment with the image of an eagle exhibits poor estimate in production, due to which the first two toes are shorter and cramped in the shield frame.

14 I would like to thank Luka Štefan, mag. archeol., for his detailed analysis of important numismatic finds. The results are presented in the text below.

proizvodnji.<sup>13</sup> Osim na lokalnu proizvodnju, daljnja bi istraživanja mogla ukazati, kao što je slučaj u lloku, koji je većinu vremena u promatranome razdoblju imao iste vlasnike kao Orahovica, ne samo na regionalnu trgovinu, već i na povezanost s moćnim trgovačkim i gospodarskim središtima (Tomičić 2004: 146).

### Novac

Značajna su tri numizmatička nalaza pronađena u arheološkim istraživanjima 2019. godine.<sup>14</sup> Pronađen je srebrni denar (PN 6), najvjerojatnije ugarskoga porijekla. Dosta je oštećen i izlisan, ali se na aversu prepoznaje grb, a na reversu je vidljiv dio križa. Okvirno ga se može datirati u kraj 14. ili početak 15. st. Za jedan primjerak (PN 9) teško je odrediti je li srebrni denar ili *quarting*. Vjerojatno je ugarskoga porijekla, a zbog izlisanosti nije moguće prepoznati što se nalazilo na aversu. Na reversu se nalazi patrijarhalni križ s oznakom. Okvirno se također datira u kraj 14. ili početak 15. st. Jedan je nalaz ipak dovoljno dobro sačuvan za točno datiranje. Srebrni *quarting* (PN 1) najznačajniji je nalaz pronađen 2019. godine. Iako je zbog izlisanosti teško odrediti, na aversu je vjerojatno bila kruna, a na reversu se nalazi patrijarhalni križ s oznakom između dvije grede (sl. 20). Ovaj srebrni *quarting* kovan je u vrijeme vladavine kralja Žigmunda Luksemburškog, najvjerojatnije u periodu između 1430. i 1437. godine. Kao takav, postavlja *terminus ante quem non* sloju SJ 37 u kojemu je pronađen uz veliku količinu prethodno obrađene stolne i kuhinjske keramike, u 1430. godinu. Zbog bogatstva nalaza koje je sadržavao, sloj SJ 37 igrat će važnu ulogu u razumijevanju konačne stratigrafske situacije na ovome lokalitetu. Važno je spomenuti da je od ostalih metalnih nalaza, uz nekoliko čavala bez datacijske vrijednosti, pronađeno i nekoliko predmeta koji još nisu podloženi konzervatorsko-restauratorskom zahvatu (Janeš 2019: 28).

### KURIJA KAO VREMENSKI I FUNKCIONALNO UNIVERZALNA POJAVA

Iako većina poznatih kurija nastaje na prijelazu iz srednjega u novi vijek, njihovu pojavu može se pratiti već od 12. i 13. st. Česta pojava tog pojma pronalazi se u 12. st. kada se na području današnje Slovačke i Češke poistovjećuje s *pfaltzom*, tj. s rezidencijom ili palačom unutar utvrde. Općenito, u srednjoj Europi u razdoblju 12. st. termin kurija označavao je palaču, a u 13. st. utvrđenu kuću nižega plemstva (Vučetić 2006: 415). Termin kurija se kroz čitavi srednji vijek koristi i za razne rezidencije koje se ne pripisuju ruralnome miljeu. Ta strana termina nije predmet istraživanja ovog rada.<sup>15</sup> Alexander T. Ruttkay u svome radu o

two beams (Fig. 20). This silver *quarting* was minted during the reign of King Sigismund of Luxemburg, probably in the period between 1430 and 1437. As such, it sets the *terminus ante quem non* for layer SU 37, in which it was discovered alongside a large quantity of previously analysed tableware and kitchenware, to the year 1430. Due to the abundance of finds it contained, layer SU 37 will play an important role in understanding the final stratigraphic situation of this site. It is important to mention that, out of the remaining metal finds, alongside a few nails of no use for dating, a couple of objects that have not yet been conserved and restored were discovered (Janeš 2019: 28).



Sl. 20 Avers i revers ugarskoga *quartinga* (PN 1) (snimio: L. Štefan)  
Fig. 20 Obverse and reverse of Hungarian *quarting* (SF 1) (photo by: L. Štefan)

### MANOR HOUSE AS A TEMPORALLY AND FUNCTIONALLY UNIVERSAL PHENOMENON

Although most known manor houses were built at the turn of the Middle Ages to the early modern period, their appearance can be traced from the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. The term *curia* was often used in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, when it was identified with *pfaltz*, i.e. a residence or palace within a castle in Slovakia and Czechia. In general, in Central Europe in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, the term *curia* signified a palace, and in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, a fortified house of lower nobility (Vučetić 2006: 415). The term *curia* was also used for various residences not assigned to the rural milieu during the Middle Ages. That aspect of the term is not the focus of this paper.<sup>15</sup> Alexander T. Ruttkay stated in his paper about fortified places in lowland regions of Slovakia that manor houses (*Herrenhöfe – Kurien*) represent the earliest form of aristocratic residences and that they appear in that form in written sources as early as the 11<sup>th</sup> century (Ruttkay 2006: 398). Istvan Feld emphasized that manor houses were residences for the occasional habitation of kings as early as the 13<sup>th</sup> century. A network of such manor houses, built on royal estates, covered a significant part of the Kingdom (Feld 2018: 118). Royal manor houses in Slovakia played an important role in the organization of the economy in the 13<sup>th</sup> century (Čaplovič et al. 1985: 253). Aside from the economic, they also had residential and

13 Lokalna proizvodnja može se prepoznati po lošije izvedenom motivu, po nekim pojednostavljenijima prikaza, gubitku detalja itd. (Tkáčec 2010a: 77). Na primjeru ulomka s prikazom orla vidljiva je loša procjena prilikom izrade, zbog čega su prednja dva prsta noge kraća i zbijena u okvir štita.

14 Ovom prilikom zahvaljujemo Luki Štefanu, mag. archeol., na detaljnoj analizi važnih numizmatičkih nalaza. Dalje u tekstu iznose se rezultati spomenute analize.

15 Za više o tome što se sve smatralo kurijom kroz duga stoljeća srednjeg vijeka vidi Vučetić 2006.

15 For more about manor houses through the long centuries of the Middle Ages, see Vučetić 2006.

utvrđenim mjestima u nizinskim regijama Slovačke navodi da kurije (*Herrenhöfe – Kurien*) predstavljaju najstariji oblik aristokratskih rezidencija te da se u tome obliku pojavljuju u pisanim izvorima već u 11. st. (Ruttikay 2006: 398). Istvan Feld naglašava da su kurije bile rezidencije povremenoga obitavanja kraljeva već u 13. st. Mreža takvih kurija, nastalih na kraljevskim posjedima, prekrivala je značajan dio Kraljevstva (Feld 2018: 118). Kraljevske kurije u Slovačkoj su u 13. st. igrale važnu ulogu u organizaciji gospodarstva (Čaplovič et al. 1985: 253). Osim ekonomske, imale su i stambenu te crkvenu funkciju (Čaplovič et al. 1985: 246). Kurije su igrale i važnu ulogu u gospodarstvu srednjovjekovnoga ruralnog kraja na području današnje Češke (Chotěbor, Smetánka 1985: 47). Manje kurije pripadale su manjim feudalnim gospodarima te su služile za gospodarenje posjedima i prikupljanje različitih oblika feudalne rente. Veće su kurije, osim velikim feudalnim gospodarima, mogle pripadati i crkvenim institucijama, ali i imućnim građanima (Chotěbor, Smetánka 1985: 56). Na području Moravske kurije se pojavljuju u 11. i 12. st. U isto vrijeme razvijaju se i utvrđene kurije (Měřínský 1981: 193). Utvrđene kurije (*befestigten Herrenhöfe*), pogotovo one na uzvisinama, igrale su važnu ulogu u nastajanju privatnih feudalnih sjedišta prije 13. st. (Čaplovič et al. 1985: 253). Prema istraživanjima u Moravskoj i Slovačkoj, utvrđene kurije su često bile građene na privatnim posjedima. No, ovdje dolazi do terminološke zamućenosti jer se utvrđene kurije, koje se nalaze na uzvisinama, često funkcionalno i terminološki miješaju s kategorijom utvrda (Čaplovič et al. 1985: 246).

Zbog toga ćemo se nakratko dotaknuti problema terminologije. Funkcionalnom i terminološkom miješanju pridonosi rijetka mogućnost povezivanja rezultata arheoloških istraživanja s pojedinim spomenom iz izvora (Virágos 2006: 19). Problemu su pridonijeli i vlasnici posjeda koji iz različitih razloga oslovljavaju posjed nazivom koji će mu dati veću vrijednost. Bolji društveni status omogućavao je manipulaciju ugledom pojedinoga posjeda.<sup>16</sup> Svako zemljišno dobro posjedovano temeljem plemićkoga prava moglo se zvati kurija (Virágos 2006: 21–22). Kurija je u pravnome smislu označavala i (kraljevski) dvor, odnosno često se tumači kao „dvorno mjesto“ (Rady 2000: 127; Virágos 2006: 21; Vučetić 2006: 423). Termin se koristio za kraljevske i biskupske provincijske te lovačke rezidencije (Feld 2018: 127). Uglavnom je riječ o tipu zgrade koji je bio samo dijelom ili uopće nije bio utvrđen (Virágos 2006: 21).

Težnja prema reprezentativnosti te razmjerno mirno razdoblje bez vojnih sukoba utjecat će i na razvoj kurija koje se od 14. st. često grade kao samostojeće zgrade bez fortifikacijskih elemenata. Općenito, u 14. st. započinje intenzivnija izgradnja kurija u srednjoj Europi te ih se može

ecclesiastical functions (Čaplovič et al. 1985: 246). Manor houses also played an important role in the economy of the medieval rural regions in the area of today's Czechia (Chotěbor, Smetánka 1985: 47). Smaller manor houses belonged to minor feudal lords and served for managing estates and collecting various forms of feudal rent. Larger manor houses, in addition to high nobility, could belong to the Church, but also wealthier townspeople (Chotěbor, Smetánka 1985: 56). In the area of Moravia, manor houses appear in the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries. At the same time, fortified manor houses developed as well (Měřínský 1981: 193). Fortified manor houses (*befestigten Herrenhöfe*), especially the ones at elevated positions, played important roles in the creation of private feudal centres before the 13<sup>th</sup> century (Čaplovič et al. 1985: 253). According to research conducted in Moravia and Slovakia, fortified manor houses were often built on private estates. But, this leads to terminological confusion, because fortified manors, built at elevated positions, are often functionally and terminologically confused with castles (Čaplovič et al. 1985: 246).

Due to that, we will briefly touch upon the problem of terminology. Rare opportunities for linking archaeological research results with certain mentions in sources contribute to terminological confusion (Virágos 2006: 19). Owners of estates also contributed to the problem; due to various reasons, they used various terms for their estates which would add to their value. Better social status enabled them to manipulate the image of a certain estate.<sup>16</sup> Every piece of land owned on the basis of the right given to nobility could be called *curia* (Virágos 2006: 21–22). *Curia* in the legal sense also signified (royal) court, i.e. it is often interpreted as “court place” (Rady 2000: 127; Virágos 2006: 21; Vučetić 2006: 423). The term was used for royal and episcopal provincial and hunting residences (Feld 2018: 127). In general, it was the type of building only partly fortified or completely unfortified (Virágos 2006: 21).

Aspiration towards representativeness and a relatively peaceful period without military conflicts affected the development of manor houses, which since the 14<sup>th</sup> century have often been built as free-standing structures without elements of fortification. In general, manor houses started being built more intensively in Central Europe in the 14<sup>th</sup> century and can be divided into two types – the free-standing structures and those that are part of an elaborate complex (Vučetić 2006: 419, 423). Relocation of nobility from castles to rural residences was best researched in England. Virágos thinks that such changes took part in Hungary as early as the 13<sup>th</sup> century (Virágos 2006: 128). According to Vučetić, manor houses as comfortable dwellings partly replaced burghs in their roles as centres of estates from the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Vučetić 2006: 419). During the reign of King Louis I of Hungary (1342–1382), István Feld states, most aristocrats

16 Richárd Horváth i Tamás Pálosfalvi uveli su, na osnovi francuske i engleske historiografije, trodijelnu podjelu plemićkih rezidencija – *castrum*, *castellum* i *domus nobilitaris* (Miljan 2015: 33). András Kubiny *castrum* veže uz aristokraciju, *castellum* uz velike zemljoposjednike, a *curia* uz ostale plemiće – idealistično povezivanje objekata s društvenim statusom za koje ne postoje konkretni dokazi, smatra Virágos. Prema Virágosu su *castrum*, *castellum* i *curia* kategorije koje su se koristile u službenim dokumentima kako bi se prikazao status (Virágos 2006: 122).

16 Richárd Horváth and Tamás Pálosfalvi introduced, based on French and English historiography, three-part classification of aristocratic residences – *castrum*, *castellum*, and *domus nobilitaris* (Miljan 2015: 33). András Kubiny linked *castrum* with aristocracy, *castellum* with large landowners, and *curia* with other nobility – Virágos consider this to be idealistic linking of buildings to social status for which there is no firm evidence. According to Virágos, *castrum*, *castellum*, and *curia* are categories used in official documents to project status (Virágos 2006: 122).

podijeliti u dva tipa – one koje su samostojeće zgrade te one koje su dio složenoga kompleksa (Vučetić 2006: 419, 423). U Engleskoj je najbolje istražen prelazak plemstva iz utvrda u ruralne rezidencije. Virágos smatra da se takve strukturalne promjene odvijaju u Ugarskoj već u 13. st. (Virágos 2006: 128). Prema Vučetiću, kurije kao komfornе nastambe dijelom zamjenjuju burgove u ulozi središta imanja otprilike od druge polovice 14. st. (Vučetić 2006: 419). U vrijeme vladavine kralja Ludovika (1342. – 1382.), navodi István Feld, većina plemstva živjela je u selima, odnosno u kurijama kraj župnih crkvi (Feld 2018: 122). On se slaže s Palom Engelom da su teško pristupačne utvrde bile slabo naseljene u 13. st. i da su kasnije primarno služile kao administrativni centri za posjede koji su se razvili oko njih. Kurije građene u naseljima vjerojatno su igrale važniju rezidencijalnu ulogu (Feld 2004: 72). Erik Fügedi dijelom govori u korist toj ideji kada navodi Iločke koji su iz utvrde Batorko, izgrađene u 13. st., u mirnim desetljećima 14. st. preselili u rezidencijalnu palaču koja je bila središte posjeda zvanog Várpalota (Fügedi 1986: 140). Udio utvrda u aristokratskim rezidencijama tako je prije 1430-ih godina iznosio manje od četvrtinu, ali već početkom 16. st. većina aristokracije živi u utvrdama (Virágos 2006: 129). Feld iznosi sumnju u kojoj je mjeri plemstvo zapravo koristilo utvrde na vrhovima brda ili okružene močvarama kao svoje rezidencije (Feld 2018: 121). On smatra da su u doba razvoja magnata, za vrijeme vladavine kralja Žigmunda, lako pristupačni, u nizinama i pogodni za život utvrđeni kompleksi, poput onih u Várpaloti i Kisdáni, primarno korišteni kao rezidencije. Četrdesetih godina 15. st. izgrađeni su mnogi takvi kompleksi koji koriste starije kurije kao podloge (Feld 2004: 73). Općenito, u 15. st. raste broj utvrđenih kurija, ponajviše na područjima izloženima vanjskoj opasnosti (Fügedi 1986: 141). Velik broj njih građen je na području oko starijih teško pristupačnih utvrda, pokraj i u takozvanim središnjim mjestima, uglavnom urbanim središtima (Feld 2004: 73). Ipak, ne može se govoriti o velikom napuštanju utvrda u korist pristupačnih rezidencija jer dostupni podaci svjedoče da je u drugoj polovici 15. st. jako malo utvrda napušteno (Feld 2004: 75–76).

Nadalje, u Hrvatskoj slijedi razdoblje takozvane „kurijalizacije“ uzrokovano podjelama veleposjeda. Proces „kurijalizacije“ započinje u Slavoniji u 15. st., a u 16. st. širi se u sjeverozapadnu Hrvatsku te kasnije, od 17. st., postupno zahvaća i Gorski kotar, Primorje i dio Istre (Vučetić 2006: 415). Dolazi do podjele veleposjeda na manje posjede organizirane oko kurije kao sjedišta imanja (Horvat-Levaj 2015: 441). Feudalci, uglavnom iz ekonomskih razloga, odvajaju od svojih vlastelinstava manje posjede i daruju ih plemićima (Žmegač 2008: 84). Prema Hrvoju Petriću to je dovelo do gospodarskoga jačanja jer su prirodni potencijali bili jače angažirani (Petrić 2007: 76). Odličan primjer je zagorski feud koji je bio usitnjen tijekom procesa „kurijalizacije“, zbog čega je u zagorski prostor u rasponu od kraja 16. do kraja 19. st. utisnuta neuobičajeno gusta mreža dvoraca i kurija (Beusan 2005: 220). Na Ludbreškom vlastelinstvu je tijekom 17. st. došlo do svojevrsnoga razgrađiva-

lived in villages, i.e. in manor houses next to parish churches (Feld 2018: 122). He agrees with Pál Engel that difficult to access castles were poorly inhabited in the 13<sup>th</sup> century and that later they served primarily as administrative centres for estates developed around them. Manor houses built in settlements probably played a more important residential role (Feld 2004: 72). Erik Fügedi partly supports that idea, mentioning the members of the House of Ilok who moved from Batorko castle, built in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, to a residential palace, the centre of the estate called Várpalota in peaceful decades of the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Fügedi 1986: 140). The share of fortifications in aristocratic residences thus amounted to less than a quarter before the 1430s, but as early as the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century most of the aristocracy lived in fortifications (Virágos 2006: 129). Feld doubts the extent to which the nobility actually used castles on hilltops or surrounded by swamps as their residences (Feld 2018: 121). He considers that at the time of the rise of the magnates, during the reign of King Sigismund, easily accessible fortified complexes in lowlands, suitable for living, such as the ones in Várpalota and Kisdáni, were primarily used as residences. During the fifth decade of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, many such complexes were built, using older manor houses as bases (Feld 2004: 73). In general, the number of fortified manor houses rose in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, mostly in areas exposed to danger (Fügedi 1986: 141). A large number of them were built around older, difficult to approach castles, next to and in so-called central places, mostly urban (Feld 2004: 73). Nevertheless, we cannot talk about a massive abandonment of castles in favour of easily accessible residences, because the available data testifies that very few castles were abandoned in the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Feld 2004: 75–76).

Furthermore, a period of so-called “curialization” follows in Croatia, caused by partitions of large estates. The process of “curialization” started in Slavonia in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, and in the 16<sup>th</sup> it spread to north-western Croatia and later, from the 17<sup>th</sup> century, affected Gorski kotar, Primorje, and a part of Istria (Vučetić 2006: 415). Large estates were being divided into smaller estates, organized around the manor house as the centre of the estate (Horvat-Levaj 2015: 441). Feudal lords, mostly for economic reasons, detached smaller estates from their feudal possessions and gave them to noblemen (Žmegač 2008: 84). According to Hrvoje Petrić, this led to economic growth due to natural resources being more engaged (Petrić 2007: 76). One good example is the feudal possession of Hrvatsko zagorje, fragmented during the process of “curialization”, due to which an unusually dense network of castles and manor houses appeared in that area from the 16<sup>th</sup> to the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Beusan 2005: 220). The feudal possession of Ludbreg went through disintegration during the 17<sup>th</sup> century, due to the noblemen of Ludbreg granting other, lower nobility, a large number of serfs.<sup>17</sup> “Curialization” of estates in Međimurje during the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century was also well documented (Vučetić 2009: 181). All in all, the construction of manor houses in continental Croatia took

17 Hrvoje Petrić states that new estates “came about when feudal lords granted groups of serfs, deserted settlements, and various agricultural lands to lower and middle rank aristocracy. The aristocracy built their manor houses and organized allodial economy at settlements they were granted” (Petrić 2007: 75).

nja staroga vlastelinstva zbog količine zalaganja kmetova od strane ludbreške vlastele.<sup>17</sup> Dobro je zabilježena i „kurijalizacija“ vlastelinskih posjeda u Međimurju tijekom 16. i 17. st. (Vučetić 2009: 181). Sve u svemu, izgradnja kurija na području kontinentalne Hrvatske uzima maha upravo u 17. st., predstavljajući ujedno dio procesa „kurijalizacije“ (Horvat-Levaj 2015: 441).

### Troprostorna podjela

Prilikom istraživanja kurija postavlja se pitanje njihove izvornosti, a osobito izvornosti troprostornoga plana u kojemu su mnoge od njih, poput kurije kraj Orahovice, građene. U Ugarskoj su kuća seljaka, kuća građanina i kuća plemića imale jednaku troprostornu strukturu u isto vrijeme, zbog čega je teško razjasniti pitanje izvornosti ovoga oblika (Virágos 2006: 86). Prema nekima, plemstvo je preuzelo jednostavan tip kuće od seljaštva i prilagodilo ga svome statusu. Prve seljačke kuće bile su poluukopane s jednom prostorijom (Virágos 2006: 86, 88). U središnjoj Europi postupna zamjena poluukopanih kuća za nadzemne kuće započinje u 10., a završava u 12. ili 13. st. (Vařeka 2018: 141). Smatra se da se promjena u načinu življenja na ugarskome selu događa između sredine 13. i sredine 14. st. U toj promjeni objekti stanovanja od poluukopanih kuća prerastaju u nadzemne strukture, a s vremenom i kuće s više prostorija (Janeš, Hirschler Marić 2019: 392).<sup>18</sup> Osim u Ugarskoj, najranije troprostorne seoske kuće u Češkoj, Moravskoj i Austriji također se datiraju u kasno 13. i početak 14. st. (Vařeka 2018: 142–144). Nadalje je troprostorni plan seljačke kuće postao jedan od omiljenih tipova u izgradnji kurija (Feld 2018: 126).

Ratko Vučetić smatra da se tvrdnja prema kojoj kurija nastaje iz seoske kuće može u potpunosti odbaciti (Vučetić 2006: 423). Neovisno o izvorištu, Vučetić je mišljenja da se kurije od dvoprostorne utvrđene kuće pretvaraju u rezidencijalne zgrade s višedijelnom horizontalnom podjelom prostorija i sa središnje postavljenim ulazom. Daljnji razvoj dovest će do nastanka troprostornih građevina sa središnjom dvoranom, rasprostiranje i trajanje kojih se može pratiti od 15. do 18. st. (Vučetić 2006: 420). U Engleskoj je dobro dokumentiran razvoj kurija. Tijekom 13. i 14. st. ondje neki prethodno jednoprostorni objekti razvijaju troprostorni plan, dok se najranije izvorno troprostorne kurije datiraju u sredinu 14. st. (King 2003: 108). Katarina Horvat-Levaj smatra da tijekom 15. st. jednokrilna rezidencija, neovisno je li podignuta unutar ili izvan naselja, zadobiva karakterističan troprostorni oblik sa središnjim

off during the 17<sup>th</sup> century, representing a part of the process of “curialization” (Horvat-Levaj 2015: 441).

### Three-room building

When researching the manors, the question arises as to their originality, and especially the authenticity of the three-room plan in which many of them, such as the manor near Orahovica, were built. In Hungary, houses of peasants, townspeople, and noblemen had the same three-room plan simultaneously, making it difficult to ascertain the origin of this division (Virágos 2006: 86). According to some, the nobility took over the simple type of house from the peasantry and adapted it to their status. The first peasant houses were semi-sunken and had one room (Virágos 2006: 86, 88). In Central Europe, the gradual replacement of semi-sunken houses with above-ground houses started in the 10<sup>th</sup> and ended in the 12<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup> century (Vařeka 2018: 141). It is thought that the shift in the lifestyle in the Hungarian countryside occurred between the mid-13<sup>th</sup> and mid-14<sup>th</sup> century. The change signified the shift from semi-sunken houses to above-ground structures, and over time, multi-room houses (Janeš, Hirschler Marić 2019: 392).<sup>18</sup> Aside from Hungary, the earliest originally three-room houses in Czechia, Moravia, and Austria are also dated to the late 13<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Vařeka 2018: 142–144). Later on, the three-room spacing of peasant houses became one of the most popular types in building manor houses (Feld 2018: 126).

Ratko Vučetić thinks that the claim that manor houses stemmed from peasant houses can be completely dismissed (Vučetić 2006: 423). Regardless of their origin, Vučetić believes that manor houses turned from fortified two-room houses to residential buildings with multi-room horizontal allocation and a central entrance. Further development would lead to the emergence of three-room buildings with a central hall, the distribution and duration of which can be traced from the 15<sup>th</sup> to the 18<sup>th</sup> century (Vučetić 2006: 420). The development of manor houses is well documented in England. During the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, some single-room structures developed a three-room floorplan, while the earliest three-room manor houses are dated to the 14<sup>th</sup> century (King 2003: 108). Katarina Horvat-Levaj believes that single-wing houses, regardless of whether they were erected within or outside of a settlement, developed a characteristic three-room shape with a central entrance during the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Their floorplan can be doubled, with two rows of rooms. Construction of such feudal residences in continental Croatia was evident in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, but it took off in the 17<sup>th</sup> century as a part of the process of “curialization” (Horvat-Levaj 2015: 441). It should also be emphasized that Duško Čikara assumes the existence of rural single-room manor houses in medieval continental Croatia, representing the simplest form of feudal architecture (Čikara 2017: 184; 2019: 389). Some believe

17 Hroje Petrić navodi da su novi posjedi „nastajali tako da su vlasnici vlastelinstva zalagali pojedinim nižim i srednjim plemićima skupine kmetova, pusta selišta i različite poljoprivredne površine. Plemići su na selištima, koja su dobili u zalog, izgradili svoje kurije i organizirali alodijalno gospodarstvo“ (Petrić 2007: 75).

18 Jedan od primjera je longitudinalna troprostorna rezidencijalna zgrada s podrumom na lokalitetu Buzadovec – Vojvodice (Janeš, Hirschler Marić 2019: 389–391). Iako se može zaključiti kako je ovo naselje funkcioniralo u drugoj polovini 13. st., u vrijeme prije spomenutih promjena, pojedini nalazi lonaca ukazuju i na kasnije razdoblje. Zbog toga treba ostaviti mogućnost datacije i do u 15. st. (Tkalčec 2013: 85).

18 One example is a longitudinal three-room residential structure with a cellar at the site of Buzadovec – Vojvodice (Janeš, Hirschler Marić 2019: 389–391). Although it can be concluded that this settlement was in function in the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the period before the already mentioned changes, certain pot finds point to a later period. Therefore, the possibility of it being dated all the way to the 15<sup>th</sup> century should be left open (Tkalčec 2013: 85).

ulazom, a tlocrtni raspored joj može biti udvostručen, s dva niza prostorija. Izgradnja takvih feudalnih rezidencija na području kontinentalne Hrvatske primjetna je već u 16., a uzima maha u 17. st. kao dio procesa „kurijalizacije“ (Horvat-Levaj 2015: 441). Valja još naglasiti da Duško Čikara pretpostavlja postojanje ruralnih jednodimenzionalnih kurija u kontinentalnoj srednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj koje su predstavljale najjednostavniji oblik feudalne arhitekture (Čikara 2017: 184; 2019: 389). Jedni smatraju da su kurije nastale iz troprostorne seljačke kuće, drugi da je seljaštvo preuzelo pojednostavljenu verziju od plemstva, a treći naglašavaju da izvorište trebamo tražiti u gradskome društvu. Bilo kako bilo, Virágos smatra da je plemstvo, posjedujući rezidencije u gradovima i na selu, igralo ulogu prenositelja ovoga tipa između različitih sredina i društava (Virágos 2006: 86).

### Geografska i funkcionalna raširenost troprostornih plemićkih rezidencija

Zbog česte prisutnosti troprostorne izvedbe tlocrta kurija, osobito u 15. st. (Vučetić 2006: 421), upravo se ta karakteristika često uzimala kao definirajuća. Prema tom se modelu analogne objekte na širem geografskom prostoru pronalazilo u sličnosti tlocrta. Tako bi se potraga za objektima koje bi se moglo nazvati sličnima ili analognima kuriji kraj Orahovice mogla temeljiti na pronalasku zgrada koje imaju troprostornu podjelu. U takvoj potrazi pronalazimo troprostornu kuriju u Alsóörsu na Balatonu, izgrađenu na prijelazu iz 15. u 16. st. (Koppány 1993: 73), koju je Ratko Vučetić naveo kao primjer „gotovo identične plemićke kurije troprostorne podjele“ (Vučetić 2006: 421). Godine 1426. kralj Žigmund dozvolio je Imrihu i Nikoli de Simony da dovrše započete gradnje na svome posjedu Simony, utvrde ih i posjeduju u vječnosti (Menclová 1973: 429). Ondje nalazimo jedan od najstarijih objekata u Slovačkoj, odnosno *fortalitium*, kako ga izvori nazivaju (Menclová 1973: 428–429), podijeljen na tri prostorije s posebnom prostorijom kao ulazom, a kojega Alexander T. Ruttkay navodi kao dio *Wasserburga* Partizánske–Šimonovany (Ruttkay 2006: 387). Slična se situacija pronalazi u Starom gradu kraj Libáňa u Češkoj koji se spominje kao *castrum* 1384. godine (Menclová 1973: 430).<sup>19</sup> I ovdje je riječ o zgradi troprostorne podjele. Dobroslava Menclová mišljenja je da ovaj objekt pokazuje sličnosti s brojnim drugim objektima u Češkoj. Ona ih povezuje s razvojem kurija koji se može pratiti sve unazad do 13. st. Menclová navodi da su temelj gradišta u Češkoj bile rezidencijalne kule koje su se prvotno sastojale od jedne ili dvije prostorije. Daljnji razvoj doveo je do objekata koji se mogu vidjeti u Libáňi i Šimonovanyu (Menclová 1973: 430). No, jasno je da su objekti poput onoga u Šimonovanyu, koji je bio dio *Wasserburga* i najvjerojatnije okružen obrambenim zidom i jarkom, funkcionalno različiti od kurije kraj Orahovice. Na lokalitetu Osijek Vojakovački – Mihalj otkrivena je kamena utvrđena kuća,<sup>20</sup> izgrađena u

that manor houses originated from three-room peasant houses, some that peasantry took over the simplified version from the nobility, while others stress that the origin could be found in townspeople. In any case, Virágos believes that nobility, owning residences in towns and the countryside, transferred this type of structure between various environments and societies (Virágos 2006: 86).

### Geographic and functional distribution of three-room aristocratic residences

Since manor houses often had three-room plans, especially in the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Vučetić 2006: 421), it was precisely this characteristic that was considered defining for manor houses. This model was used for searching for structures with analogue floorplans in a wider geographical area. Therefore, the search for structures that could be called similar or analogous to the manor house near Orahovica could be based on finding buildings with three-room plans. The search results in three-room manor house in Alsóörs at Lake Balaton, built at the turn of the 15<sup>th</sup> to the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Koppány 1993: 73) and used by Ratko Vučetić as an example of “an almost identical three-room manor house” (Vučetić 2006: 421). In 1426, King Sigismund allowed Imrih and Nikola de Simony to finish the building at their Simony estate, fortify it and own it for eternity (Menclová 1973: 429). There we find one of the oldest structures in Slovakia, or as it is called in the sources, *fortalitium* (Menclová 1973: 428–429). It is divided into three rooms with a special room as an entrance, stated as a part of Partizánske–Šimonovany *Wasserburg* by Alexander T. Ruttkay (Ruttkay 2006: 387). A similar situation can be found in Stari grad near Libáň in Czechia, mentioned as *castrum* in 1384 (Menclová 1973: 430).<sup>19</sup> This building also has a three-room plan. Dobroslava Menclová believes that this structure exhibits many similarities with numerous other structures in Czechia. She links them to the development of manor houses which can be traced back to the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Menclová states that the bases of hillforts in Czechia were residential towers, originally containing one or two rooms. Further development brought about structures that can be seen in Libáň and Šimonovany (Menclová 1973: 430). It is clear that structures similar to the one in Šimonovany, which was a part of a *Wasserburg* and probably surrounded by a defensive wall and a ditch, differ functionally from the manor house near Orahovica. A fortified stone house<sup>20</sup> was discovered at the site of Osijek Vojakovački – Mihalj, built in the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> or at the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, most probably divided into three rooms (Tkáčec 2019: 164).<sup>21</sup> This structure corresponds to the situation in Czechia, where we can find aristocratic residences alongside churches under

19 Archaeological excavations confirmed that the building originates from the 1380s (Menclová 1973: 431).

20 The earliest fortified houses in Europe date back to the 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> century. In the 12<sup>th</sup> century, they became rare, but can still be found in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries (Barz 1993: 20).

21 There might have been a structure in the area of the fortified house in the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, if not even earlier. The existence of a defensive ditch partly covered by a later stone structure points to that (Tkáčec 2019: 164).

19 Arheološka istraživanja potvrdila su datiranje zgrade u 80-e godine 14. st. (Menclová 1973: 431).

20 Najstarije utvrđene kuće u Europi datiraju se u 9. i 10. st. U 12. st. postaju rjeđe, ali ih možemo pronaći još u 13. i 14. st. (Barz 1993: 20).

drugoj polovici 13. ili početkom 14. st., koja je najvjerojatnije bila podijeljena na tri prostorije (Tkalčec 2019: 164).<sup>21</sup> Ovaj objekt odgovara situaciji kakva se pronalazi u Češkoj gdje se na pojedinim lokalitetima razvijenoga srednjeg vijeka, uz plemićke donatorske crkve, nalaze utvrđene rezidencije plemića (Tkalčec 2019: 164–165). Jedan od boljih primjera takvih rezidencija je dobro sačuvan i istražen ruralni utvrđeni posjed u Týncu nad Sazavom nedaleko Chvojne (Hejna 1977: 70–71; 1978: 81). U sklopu njega nalazi se zgrada koja je s dva poprečna zida bila podijeljena na tri prostorije. Antonin Hejna kao vremenski raspon funkcioniranja kompleksa u Týncu pretpostavlja 13. (možda već i zadnju trećinu 12. st.), pa sve do prve polovice 14. st. Prema njemu, kompleks u Týncu primjer je ruralnoga dvora, odnosno jedan od najkompletnijih prikaza gradnje ruralnih rezidencija u razdoblju vladavine Přemyslovića u Češkoj (Hejna 1977: 72–73, 76). Geografskoj raširenosti troprostorne organizacije svjedoči i kurija u Suitiai u Finskoj (Vučetić 2006: 421). Ona je izgrađena u razdoblju između 1541. i 1550. godine na pažljivo odabranome uzvišenju u središtu imanja (Schulman et al. 2008: 24).

Ovo su samo neki od primjera srednjovjekovnih rezidencija unutar kojih se prepoznaje troprostorni tlocrt.<sup>22</sup> No, i na ovih par primjera postaje jasno da se troprostorno uređene zgrade nalaze unutar funkcionalno različitih rezidencija, u širokome vremenskom razdoblju i na širokome geografskom području. Stoga, možemo zaključiti da je izgradnja u troprostornom planu bila racionalno i vjerojatno najbolje rješenje arhitektonskoga pitanja neovisno o funkcionalnoj prirodi samoga objekta ili kompleksa. Kao što je u tekstu ranije prikazano, znanstvenici navode brojne primjere iznimno rane pojave kurija u izvorima na području istočne središnje Europe. Izvori ukazuju i na to da su kurije igrale važnu ulogu u tadašnjem društvu. U takvoj su se dugoj tradiciji korištenja ovoga tipa rezidencije određeni obrasci nesumnjivo pokazali najkvalitetnijima i najkorisnijima. Nije naodmet zaključiti da je troprostornost jedan od njih. To je još jedan razlog zašto u detaljnijem proučavanju i pronalasku analogija za kuriju kraj Orahovice troprostornost nipošto ne može biti uzeta kao njezina definirajuća karakteristika.

### Stvaranje poveznica

Istraživanje kurije kraj Orahovice pokazalo je da se orahovički posjed nalazio u vlasništvu pojedinaca iznimno važnih za kasnosrednjovjekovnu hrvatsku povijest. Njih se nastojalo istražiti kako bi se istaknute pojedince moglo izdvojiti kao potencijalne graditelje kurije ili graditelje nadogradnji. Nikola Kont je u svoje vrijeme bio daleko

21 Na području utvrđene kuće možda je postojao neki objekt već u prvoj polovici 13. st., ako ne i ranije. Na njega ukazuje postojanje obrambenog jarka na koji je dijelom legao kasniji kameni objekt (Tkalčec 2019: 164).

22 Troprostorni se tlocrtni koncept, naravno, pronalazi uklopljen i u složenije komplekse. Jedan od takvih primjera je, zbog vlasničke povezanosti jako zanimljiv, palas Nikole Iločkog u Iloku. Južno stambeno krilo palasa sastojalo se od podruma, prizemlja i dva kata. Prvi i drugi kat bili su podijeljeni na tri prostorije (Horvat 2009: 44).

their patronage at developed Middle Ages sites (Tkalčec 2019: 164–165). One of the better examples of such residences is well preserved and researched rural fortified estate in Týnec nad Sazavou near Chvojna (Hejna 1977: 70–71; 1978: 81). Within it, there is a building divided into three rooms by two transverse walls. Antonin Hejna assumes that the timespan when the Týnec complex functioned was between the 13<sup>th</sup> (perhaps as early as the last third of the 12<sup>th</sup>) century to the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. According to him, the Týnec complex is an example of a rural court, i.e. one of the most complete representations of rural residences in the period of the House of Přemyslović rule in Czechia (Hejna 1977: 72–73, 76). A manor house in Suitia in Finland testifies to geographical distribution of three-room buildings (Vučetić 2006: 421). It was built between 1541 and 1550 at a carefully chosen elevation in the centre of the estate (Schulman et al. 2008: 24).

These are some of the examples of medieval residences with recognizable three-room floorplans.<sup>22</sup> But even these few examples make it clear that three-room buildings were situated within residences with different functions, during long periods and in a wide geographic area. Therefore, we can conclude that the three-room floorplan was the most rational and best solution of architectural design, regardless of the functional nature of the structure or the complex itself. As has been demonstrated earlier, scholars list many examples of the extremely early appearance of manor houses in sources in the eastern area of Central Europe. The sources also indicate that manor houses played an important role in contemporary society. In such a long tradition of using this type of residence, certain patterns have undoubtedly proved to be of the highest quality and most useful. It should be pointed out that the three-room plan is one of them. This is another reason why in the detailed study and search for analogies for the manor house near Orahovica, three-room plan cannot be taken as a defining characteristic.

### Creating links

The research of the manor house near Orahovica revealed that the Orahovica estate was owned by individuals of exceptional importance for the history of the Croatian Middle Ages. They were researched into, so that some of them could be identified as potential builders of the manor house or the additions to it. Nicholas Kont was by far the most prominent member of his family in his time and one of the main aristocrats<sup>23</sup> during the reign of King Louis I of Hungary (Mažuran 2008: 14–15). His father, Lovro Tot ("Sclavus") gained Orahovica castle and all that belonged to it in 1347 from King Louis I of Hungary in exchange for Zrin castle (Andrić, Radić 2004: 12).

22 The three-room floorplan, of course, can be found in more complicated complexes as well. One example, very interesting due to having the same owner, Nikola of Ilok's *palas* in Ilok. The southern residential wing of the *palas* had a cellar, ground floor and two floors above it. The first and the second floor were divided into three rooms (Horvat 2009: 44).

23 He served as the voivode of Transylvania (1351–1356) and palatine (1356–1367), acquired many estates in Nitra and Veszprém counties, and in 1364 he also gained the city of Ilok (Andrić, Radić 2004: 13). At the height of his power, he was the head of seven counties, mostly in the western and northern borders of the Kingdom (Andrić 2001: 34).

najznačajniji član svoga roda i jedan od glavnih velikaša<sup>23</sup> za vladavine kralja Ludovika I (Mažuran 2008: 14–15). Njegov otac, Lovro Tot („Slaven“), u zamjenu za utvrdu Zrin, dobio je 1347. godine od kralja Ludovika I. orahovičku utvrdu i sve njezine pripadnosti (Andrić, Radić 2004: 12). U proučavanju Nikole Konta pokazalo se značajnim to što je 1350. godine stekao posjed Palotu (danas Várpalota) u Vesprenskoj županiji (Andrić 2008: 85). Od tog se trenutka na ova dva posjeda može pratiti kontinuitet prijenosa vlasti na nasljednike Nikole Konta. U drugoj polovici 14. st. na posjedu Palota izgrađen je kompleks (sl. 21: 1) (Várnai 1970: 147; Gergelyffy 1970: 125).<sup>24</sup> Unutar kompleksa, koji je formiran oko dvorišta, na jugoistočnome dijelu nalazila se dvokatna pravokutna zgrada (Nagy 2015: 13). Po svojoj unutrašnjoj organizaciji ona ukazuje na troprostornu podjelu (Gergelyffy 1967: 264; László 2006: 168–169). Navedene informacije o kompleksu u Várpaloti otvaraju dvije nove mogućnosti po pitanju kurije kraj Orahovice. Prvo, iako su kurije građene već stotinama godina prije 14. st., što teoretski otvara mogućnost rane izgradnje kurije kraj Orahovice, Várpalota, obiteljski povezana s orahovičkim posjedom, otvara realnu mogućnost izgradnje kurije kraj Orahovice u drugoj polovici 14. st., što je dosta ranije nego što se uobičajvalo misliti. Drugo, s obzirom da je i kroz prvu polovicu 15. st. vidljiva vlasnička ili obiteljska povezanost ovih dvaju posjeda, i u slučaju kasnije gradnje kurije kraj Orahovice, troprostornu kuriju iz Várpalote treba uzeti kao potencijalan model prema kojemu je kurija kraj Orahovice građena. Iz toga proizlazi da bi, u duhu općenite neistraženosti ovoga tipa rezidencija u Hrvatskoj, poznavanje potencijalno srodnih rezidencija moglo olakšati istraživanje te interpretaciju rezultata dobivenih u kuriji kraj Orahovice. Kvalitetnim istraživanjem upotpunjenim spomenima u izvorima, kompleks u Várpaloti približen je već spomenutom procesu djelomičnoga preuzimanja rezidencijalne uloge od strane kurija, vidljivom od vremena vladavine kralja Ludovika I. (Feld 2018: 122), odnosno od druge polovice 14. st. (Vučetić 2006: 419).

Sljedeća faza kompleksa u Várpaloti je veliki graditeljski projekt Nikole Iločkog proveden najvjerojatnije u razdoblju od 1439. do 1445. godine (sl. 21: 3) (Gergelyffy 1970: 144; Várnai 1970: 149), nakon čega se u izvorima prethodno poznata *curia* redovito naziva *castrum* (Nagy 2015: 10).<sup>25</sup> Iz-

When researching Nicholas Kont, it is important to note that in 1350 he acquired Palota estate (present-day Várpalota) in Veszprém County (Andrić 2008: 85). From that moment on, a continuity of transfer of power at these two estates on Nicholas Kont's heirs can be traced. In the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, a complex was built at the Palota estate (Fig. 21: 1) (Várnai 1970: 147; Gergelyffy 1970: 125).<sup>24</sup> Within the complex formed around a yard, in its south-eastern part, a two-story rectangular building was situated (Nagy 2015: 13). Its internal organization points to a three-room floorplan (Gergelyffy 1967: 264; László 2006: 168–169). The stated information about the Várpalota complex opens two new possibilities regarding the manor house near Orahovica. Firstly, although manor houses were built hundreds of years before the 14<sup>th</sup> century, which theoretically opens the possibility of early construction of the manor house near Orahovica, Várpalota, linked to the Orahovica estate by a common family, opens the real possibility of manor house near Orahovica being built in the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, quite a bit earlier than it is commonly thought. Secondly, considering that the ownership or family connection of these two estates is visible throughout the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, and in the case of the later construction of the manor house near Orahovica, the three-room floorplan from Várpalota should be considered a potential model according to which the manor house near Orahovica was built. As a consequence, in the spirit of the general lack of research on this type of residence in Croatia, recognizing potentially related residences can make research and interpretation of results acquired at the manor house near Orahovica easier. By high-quality research complemented with written sources, Várpalota complex was brought closer to the aforementioned process in which manor houses partially took the residential role over, evidential from the rule of King Louis I (Feld 2018: 122), i.e. the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Vučetić 2006: 419).

The next phase of Várpalota complex was Nicholas of Ilok's great project, most probably carried out between 1439 and 1445 (Fig. 21: 3) (Gergelyffy 1970: 144; Várnai 1970: 149), after which the previously mentioned *curia* is regularly called *castrum* in the sources (Nagy 2015: 10).<sup>25</sup> A lavish castle with an inner courtyard was built (Vučetić 2006: 421). It had a regular rectangular floorplan and one tower on each corner (Fügedi


23 Obavljao je službe erdeljskoga vojvode (1351. – 1356.) i palatina (1356. – 1367.), stekao je brojna imanja u Njitranskoj i Vesprenskoj županiji, a 1364. godine i grad Ilok (Andrić, Radić 2004: 13) te je na vrhuncu svoje moći bio na čelu sedam županija, uglavnom na zapadnim i sjevernim granicama kraljevstva (Andrić 2001: 34).

24 Točno vrijeme izgradnje kompleksa do sada nije utvrđeno. Sve do kraja 14. st. izvori spominju samo obližnju utvrdu Bátorokó. Naziv Palota prvi put se spominje 1397. godine (Gergelyffy 1970: 144) te se ta godina uglavnom uzima kao godina završetka izgradnje kompleksa. András Gergelyffy navodi da se na osnovi stilističke analize također može utvrditi druga polovice 14. st. kao vrijeme izgradnje (Gergelyffy 1967: 274). Zbog toga se razdoblje u kojemu se dogodila izgradnja kompleksa Palota omeđuje godinama 1350. i 1397. (Gergelyffy 1972: 243).

25 Csaba László nije siguran u tako uski vremenski period i smatra da je riječ

24 The exact time of the building of the complex has still not been ascertained. All the way to the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, sources mention only the nearby castle of Bátorokó. The name Palota was mentioned for the first time in 1397 (Gergelyffy 1970: 144), the assumed year when building of the complex was finished. András Gergelyffy states that the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century can be ascertained as the time it was built on the basis of stylistic analysis as well (Gergelyffy 1967: 274). Therefore, the period in which the Palota complex was built is framed by years 1350 and 1397 (Gergelyffy 1972: 243).

25 Csaba László is not certain about this extremely narrow time period, and believes that it was built in the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century and not necessarily finished in 1445 (Nagy 2015: 10). Szabolcs Balázs Nagy states that housing and events in Várpalota, reconstructed on the basis of letters, suggest that main components of this castle were probably built until 1445/1446 (Nagy 2015: 12). Nevertheless, with regards to the name *castrum*, sources definitely have to be approached with caution. Gábor Virágos mentions the case of Kísnána, in which the mention of the *castrum* in sources and the construction of the fortification elements were two temporally distant phenomena (Virágos 2006: 119).



Sl. 21 Pretpostavljena arhitektonska povijest utvrde Várpalota. 1 druga polovica 14. st.; 2 kraj 14. – prva polovica 15. st.; 3 1439. – 1445.; 4 treća četvrtina 15. st. (prema: Nagy 2015: 70)

Fig. 21 Assumed architectural history of Várpalota castle. 1 Second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century; 2 the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century – first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century; 3 1439–1445; 4 third quarter of the 15<sup>th</sup> century (after: Nagy 2015: 70)

građena je raskošna utvrda s unutrašnjim dvorištem (Vučetić 2006: 421), pravilnim četverokutnim tlocrtom te po jednom kulom na svakome uglu (Fügedi 1986: 144; Horvat 2002: 207).<sup>26</sup> Ova faza gradnje jasno pokazuje kretanje u drugome smjeru od onoga vidljivog kod kurije kraj Orahovice. No, uzmu li se u obzir ambicija Nikole Iločkog, ne bi trebalo čuditi što je pregradnja starijega kompleksa poprimila mnoge sličnosti s graditeljskim stilom kojeg je koristio kraljevski dvor (Nagy 2017: 5). U Várpaloti je Nikola, čini se, nastojao izgraditi važno sjedište (Feld 2004: 54), dok je kurija kraj Orahovice krenula prema daljnjem razlaganju plana kompleksa rezidencijalno-gospodarske uloge. Andras Kubiny smatrao je *castrum* u Várpaloti sjedištem političkih ambicija koje je Nikola sredinom 15. st. imao u zapadnoj Ugarskoj. Prema Kubinyu, nakon neuspjeha tih ambicija na zapadu Kraljevstva, Nikola se okreće jugozapadu, zbog čega je često odsjedao u Orahovici (Feld 2004: 54–55). U tom je kontekstu vjerojatno više pažnje posvećeno i kuriji kraj Orahovice.<sup>27</sup> Uostalom, ona je bila odraz društvenoga statusa i moći u ruralnome okolišu i prostoru (Cosnean Nistor 2017: 7). Uključivanju kurije u širu pojavu izgradnji Nikole Iločkog možda svjedoči *quarting* kovan između 1430. i 1437. godine koji je pronađen uz temelje južnih nadogradnji.

Prema Gáboru Virágosu začeci plemićkih rezidencija u Ugarskoj, neovisno o terminologiji, mogu se podijeliti u tri tipa. Upravo obrađena rezidencija u Várpaloti ubraja se u drugi tip. Karakteristika drugog tipa je začetak kompleksa u jednoj zgradi s dvije ili tri prostorije položene u ravnini. U kasnijim fazama građene su manje prostorije kao uvećanje rezidencijalnoga i reprezentabilnoga dijela, a uslužne i proizvodne zgrade ponovno su izgrađene od kamena (Virágos 2006: 123). S obzirom da je nakon prve faze rezidencija u Várpaloti naizgled krenula u drugome smjeru u odnosu na kuriju kraj Orahovice, proučavanje drugih rezidencija koje možemo pronaći u ovome tipu moglo bi ponuditi korisne informacije. U tom je pogledu zanimljiv kompleks u Kisláni (sl. 22). U Kisláni je prvo sredinom 12. st. izgrađena crkva (Nagy 2010: 39). Tijekom

o gradnji prve polovice 15. st. koja nije nužno završena 1445. godine (Nagy 2015: 10). Szabolcs Balázs Nagy navodi da na osnovi pisama rekonstruirano stanovanje i događanja u Várpaloti sugeriraju da su glavne komponente nove utvrde vjerojatno izgrađene do 1445./1446. godine (Nagy 2015: 12). No, svakako treba s oprezom pristupiti vjerovanju izvorima po pitanju naziva *castrum*. Gábor Virágos navodi slučaj Kisláne gdje su prva pojava naziva *castrum* u izvorima i sama izgradnja fortifikacijskih elemenata bili dva vremenski odvojena fenomena (Virágos 2006: 119).

26 Riječ je o specifičnoj skupini promjena koje su se pojavile u arhitekturi utvrda Ugarske u drugoj polovici 14. st. (Nagy 2017: 10), a postale su iznimno popularne među aristokracijom tijekom vladavine kralja Žigmunda te neposrednog nemirnoga razdoblja koje je nastupilo nakon njegove smrti (Buzás 2001: 56). Mnogi su znanstvenici mišljenja da je riječ o rezidencijalnim objektima koji nisu imali posebnoga vojnog značaja nego su izgrađeni kao prikazi statusa (Feld 2018: 125). Osim toga, ovaj tip gradnje je fizički lako pristupačan i udoban (Feld 2004: 73) te prioritizira reprezentativnost ispred funkcionalnosti (Nagy 2017: 391). Za kraljevske i aristokratske primjere vidi Fügedi 1986: 144; Nagy 2017: 1–2; Horvat 2002: 207; Feld 2018: 122; Buzás 2001: 57.


27 Nikola Iločki je kao kralj Bosne najviše isprava izdao u vlastitim utverdama u Iloku i Orahovici (Horváth 2015: 578).

1986: 144; Horvat 2002: 207).<sup>26</sup> This phase of construction clearly shows the direction different from the one seen at the manor house near Orahovica. Nevertheless, if we take into consideration Nicholas of Ilok's ambition, we should not be surprised that the reconstructed earlier complex assumed many similarities with the construction style used by the royal court (Nagy 2017: 5). It seems that Nicholas tried to build important headquarters in Várpalota (Feld 2004: 54), while the manor house near Orahovica progressed in the direction of further expanding the complex plan with the residential and economic role. Andras Kubiny believed that the *castrum* in Várpalota was the centre of political ambitions Nicholas had in western Hungary in the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century. According to Kubiny, after those ambitions failed in the western part of the Kingdom, Nicholas turned to the south-west, due to which he often stayed in Orahovica (Feld 2004: 54–55). Accordingly, more attention was probably given to the manor house near Orahovica.<sup>27</sup> Besides, it was a reflection of his social status and power in rural surroundings and environment (Cosnean Nistor 2017: 7). A *quarting* minted between 1430 and 1437 discovered alongside foundations of the southern additions probably testifies to the manor house near Orahovica needing to be included in a wider context of Nicholas of Ilok's construction.

According to Gábor Virágos, the origin of aristocratic residences in Hungary, terminology notwithstanding, can be classified into three types. The residence in Várpalota is included in the second type. The characteristic of the second type is the complex having origin in one building with two or three aligned rooms. Smaller rooms were built in later phases to add to the residential and representative part of the structure, and service and agricultural buildings were rebuilt out of stone (Virágos 2006: 123). Since it seems that the residence in Várpalota changed direction after the first phase compared to the manor house near Orahovica, studying other residences of this type we can find could offer useful information. The complex in Kislána is interesting in this respect (Fig. 22). A church was first built there in the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century (Nagy 2010: 39). During the 14<sup>th</sup> century, Kompolti family built the first residence, 20–25 metres from the church (Nagy 2011: 168). Until the middle of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the church gained its final appearance and was incorporated in the residential and economic complex in Kislána (Nagy 2010: 40), which at first was not fortified, but later it reached a very high fortification level (Virágos 2006: 40). A thick wall, built around the residential buildings and the church after the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century, turned the complex in Kislána into

26 These were part of a specific group of changes that appeared in the castle architecture of Hungary in the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Nagy 2017: 10) and became extremely popular among the aristocracy during the reign of King Sigismund and directly before the immediate turbulent period that followed his death (Buzás 2001: 56). Many scholars believe that those were residential structures without military importance and which were built to show status (Feld 2018: 125). Besides, this type of structure is physically easily accessible and comfortable (Feld 2004: 73) and it gives priority to representativeness over functionality (Nagy 2017: 391). For royal and aristocratic examples, see Fügedi 1986: 144; Nagy 2017: 1–2; Horvat 2002: 207; Feld 2018: 122; Buzás 2001: 57.

27 Nicholas of Ilok, as King of Bosnia, issued most documents in his own castles of Ilok and Orahovica (Horváth 2015: 578).



Sl. 22 Pretpostavljeni razvoj rezidencijalnoga kompleksa u Kisnáni (prema: Virágos 2006: 42)  
Fig. 22 Assumed development of residential complex in Kisnána (after: Virágos 2006: 42)

14. st. obitelj Kompolti gradi prvu rezidenciju, 20–25 m udaljenu od crkve (Nagy 2011: 168). Daljnjim razvojem, do sredine 15. st., crkva je zadobila konačan izgled te je uklopljena u rezidencijalno-gospodarski kompleks u Kisdána (Nagy 2010: 40) koji prvotno nije bio utvrđen, ali je kasnije dosegao jako visoku razinu fortifikacije (Virágos 2006: 40). Debeli zid, koji je izgrađen oko rezidencijalnih zgrada i crkve nakon sredine 15. st., pretvorio je kompleks u Kisdáni u pravi *castrum* (Virágos 2006: 52).<sup>28</sup> Vidljiva je vremenska podudarnost s istim procesom u Várpaloti. Konačnim fazama izgradnje Kisdána, kao i Várpalota, postaje prvorazredni primjer rezidencije ugarskih magnata u 15. st. (Feld 2004: 71). Prva rezidencija u Kisdáni bila je troprostorna kurija izgrađena negdje iza 1390. godine (Virágos 2006: 50). Kroz stoljeće i pol rezidencijalni je dio kroz sedam faza nadograđivan dok nije dosegao konačan izgled.<sup>29</sup>

U kuriji kraj Orahovice zasad možemo pratiti četiri faze izgradnje. Prvu fazu predstavlja glavna zgrada kurije od koje neistražen ostaje jedino nastavak istočnoga zida prema jugu. U drugoj fazi na glavnu zgradu dograđene su južne prostorije. Na jugozapadnu prostoriju u trećoj fazi dozidan je zid smjera istok – zapad koji se u obliku slova L lomi prema sjeveru. U četvrtoj je fazi na taj zid s južne strane dozidan još jedan zid.<sup>30</sup> Sličnost kurije kraj Orahovice s kurijom u Várpaloti vidljiva je u prvoj fazi. Iako je kompleks u Kisdáni pretvoren u utvrdu, s kurijom kraj Orahovice dijeli razvoj kroz više faza. Oba kompleksa u kasnijim fazama pokazuju nadogradnju pomoćnih zgrada na glavnu troprostornu zgradu koja je bila središte kompleksa. Postoje i druge rezidencije koje, za razliku od Várpalote i Kisdáne, svoj razvoj ne završavaju kao utvrde. Sjeverno krilo kompleksa u Nyírbátoru troprostorna je zgrada na dva kata s podrumom. Na južni se zid ove zgrade pružaju četiri okomita zida koji ukazuju na više faza gradnje. Ova rezidencija izvorno nije sadržavala fortifikacijske elemente, a do sada je od spomenutih pronađen jedino kružni ugaoni bastion napravljen od drvenih stupova te obložen glinom (Virágos 2006: 70, 72). Pojavu obrambenih elemenata na kurijama možemo pripisati općenitom trendu rasta broja utvrđenih kurija u 15. st. (Fügedi 1986: 141). Treba napomenuti da se kurija kraj Orahovice nalazi znatno bliže utvrdi, Ružica gradu, nego što je to slučaj kod promatranih rezidencija. Na južnim dogradnjama kurije kraj Orahovice nalazi se jedan otvor koji je prvotno djelomično zazidan, čime je pretvoren u prozor, a tek je kasnije cijeli zazidan, čime je pretvoren u nišu. Otvor pokraj njega prvotno je služio kao puškarnica, ali je kasnije također zazidan (Janeš 2019: 17–18). Daljnja istraživanja pokazat će je li ovo jedini obrambeni element na kuriji i može li se pripisati spomenutom trendu pojave obrambenih elemenata na sličnim rezidencijama. Treba

a real *castrum* (Virágos 2006: 52).<sup>28</sup> There is a visible temporal correspondence with the same process in Várpalota. With the final construction phases Kisdána, as well as Várpalota, became a first-class example of residence of Hungarian magnates in the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Feld 2004: 71). The first residence in Kisdána was a three-room manor house built sometime after 1390 (Virágos 2006: 50). Additional buildings were added in seven different phases during a century and a half until the complex reached its final design.<sup>29</sup>

In the manor house near Orahovica, we can, in the time being, recognize four phases of construction. The first phase is represented by the main building, with only the continuation of the eastern wall towards the south remaining unexcavated. In the second phase, two southern rooms were added to the main building. In the third phase, a wall of east-west direction was added to the southwestern room, which breaks in the shape of the letter L towards the north. In the fourth phase, another wall was added to that wall on the south side.<sup>30</sup> Similarities between the manor house near Orahovica and the manor house in Várpalota are visible in the first phase. Although the complex in Kisdána was turned into a castle, multiple of its phases are similar to the ones in Orahovica. In later phases, both complexes exhibit additions to the main three-room building, the centre of the complex, in the form of service and agricultural buildings. There are other residences that, unlike Várpalota and Kisdána, did not end in the form of a castle. The northern wing of the complex in Nyírbátor is a three-room building with two floors and a cellar. There are four walls perpendicular to the southern wall of this building, pointing to multiple construction phases. This residence originally did not have fortification elements, and only a circular corner bastion, made of wooden columns covered with clay, was discovered (Virágos 2006: 70, 72). The appearance of defensive elements in manor houses can be attributed to a general rise in the number of fortified manor houses in the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Fügedi 1986: 141). It should be noted that the manor house near Orahovica is situated much closer to the castle, Ružica grad, than it is the case with other comparable residences. There is one opening on the southern additions of the manor house near Orahovica. It was initially walled up and turned into a window, while only later it was walled up completely and turned into a niche. The opening next to it was at first used as a loophole, but later it was also walled up (Janeš 2019: 17–18). Further research will show whether this was the only defensive element on the manor house and whether it can be assigned to the aforementioned trend of adding defensive elements to similar residences. We should bear in mind that, regardless of function, military elements were almost always present in places where nobility resided (Hannson 2009: 442). During the excavation of the complex in Pomáz, no evidence of fortification was discovered (Virágos 2006: 26). Although it does not originate from a three-

28 Istvan Feld smatra da je kurija u Kisdáni pretvorena u utvrdu prije 1445. godine (Feld 2004: 71).

29 Za pregled faza vidi Virágos 2006: 42.

30 Dakako, u trenutnoj fazi istraživanja ne možemo govoriti o većoj ili manjoj vremenskoj udaljenosti faza gradnje. Ovdje samo konstatiramo ono što je vidljivo prema spojevima zidova.

28 Istvan Feld believes that the manor house in Kisdána was turned into a castle before 1445 (Feld 2004: 71).

29 For the summary of all phases, see Virágos 2006: 42.

30 Of course, in the present-day research stage, we cannot say anything about the temporal distance of the construction phases. We can only establish what is visible in the wall joints.

imati na umu da su, neovisno o funkciji, vojni elementi gotovo uvijek prisutni na mjestima gdje prebiva plemstvo (Hansson 2009: 442). Prilikom istraživanja kompleksa u Pomázu nisu pronađeni elementi utvrđivanja (Virágos 2006: 26). Iako izvoršte nema u troprostornoj zgradi, kao neutvrđeni kompleks mogao bi se pokazati funkcionalno srodnim kuriji kraj Orahovice.<sup>31</sup> I ranije razdoblje sigurno sadrži rezidencije podobne za uspoređivanje.<sup>32</sup> Navedene su rezidencije kroz više faza završile u složenim kompleksima oko centralnoga dvorišta, okružene zidom i s crkvom koja im je bila pripojena ili se nalazila u neposrednoj blizini. Tijekom arheoloških istraživanja 2020. godine, 30-ak m jugozapadno od glavne zgrade kurije, pronađen je zid smjera sjever – jug (sl. 23: označeno crveno). Oko 25 m jugoistočno od toga zida vidljivi su tragovi struktura u umjetno prokopanom jarku (sl. 23: označeno zeleno). U morfologiji terena, na području između novootkrivenoga zida i struktura u jarku, moguće je pretpostaviti dodatne strukture (sl. 23: označeno plavo). Ovim otkrićima, kao i prethodno navedenim dogradnjama na glavnu zgradu kurije, kurija kraj Orahovice primiče se navedenoj skupini rezidencijalno-gospodarskih kompleksa koje je Gabor Virágos u svojoj podijeli odvojio kao drugi tip koji kroz više faza završavaju u dvorišnom ograđenom planu. Daljnje proučavanje takvih kompleksa igrat će važnu ulogu u razumijevanju kurije kraj Orahovice.

Zbog velike blizine Ružice grada često se postavlja pitanje uloge kurije kraj Orahovice. Upravo zbog te blizine Mladen Radić smatra da je u vezi kurije malo vjerojatno da se radi o ladanjskom prebivalištu Iločkih, već da je riječ o gospodarskoj ili upravnoj zgradi velikoga orahovičkog posjeda (Radić 2014: 73–74). Kuriji kraj Orahovice slične rezidencije sugeriraju mješavinu ovih dvaju funkcija s većim naglaskom na jednu ili drugu ulogu. Tako je prilikom istraživanja u Kislánu utvrđeno da je veću važnost imala stambeno-representativna uloga, dok je kod kompleksa u Pomázu gospodarsko-administrativna funkcija bila naglašenija s pronađenim tragovima bavljenja vinogradarstvom, postojanja kovača, zlatara i sl. (Virágos 2006: 112). Zbog sačuvane konzole kamina, moguće je pretpostaviti da je druga etaža kurije kraj Orahovice imala reprezentativnu ulogu (Vučetić 2006: 421). S druge strane, veći broj nadograđenih pomoćnih prostorija sugerira gospodarsku

room building, as an unfortified complex, it could prove to be functionally related to the manor house near Orahovica.<sup>31</sup> There have to be residences suitable for comparison in an earlier period as well.<sup>32</sup> The aforementioned residences, after multiple phases, ended as parts of complicated complexes around the central courtyard, surrounded by a wall, and with a church attached to them or in their close vicinity. During archaeological excavation in 2020, about 30 m southwest of the main building of the manor house, a north-south wall was found (Fig. 23: marked red). Around 25 m southeast of that wall, traces of structures in an artificially dug out trench are visible (Fig. 23: marked green). It is possible to assume there are some additional structures in terrain morphology, in the area between the newly discovered wall and the structures in the ditch (Fig. 23: marked blue). These discoveries, as well as the aforementioned additions to the main building of the manor house, bring the manor house near Orahovica closer to the group of residential and economic complexes which Gabor Virágos identified as the second type in his classification, that after multiple phases ends in the enclosed courtyard. Further research into such complexes will play an important role in understanding the manor house near Orahovica.


The question of the role of the manor house near Orahovica is often posed due to its proximity to Ružica grad. Precisely this proximity is the reason for Mladen Radić to believe that it is unlikely for the manor house to be a countryside residence of the House of Ilok, but that it was an economic or administrative building of the great estate of Orahovica (Radić 2014: 73–74). Residences similar to the manor house near Orahovica suggest a blend of these two functions with the emphasis on one or the other purpose. During the excavation in Kislána, it was established that the residential and representative roles had greater importance, while the complex in Pomáz had a greater economic and administrative function, with evidence of viticulture, the existence of blacksmiths, goldsmiths, etc. (Virágos 2006: 112). Due to a preserved fireplace corbel, it is possible to assume that the second floor of the manor house near Orahovica had a representative role (Vučetić 2006: 421). On the other hand, a higher number of auxiliary buildings suggest an economic function. We will certainly find a blend of residential- representative and economic-administrative function at the manor house near Orahovica as well. Nevertheless, only the correct documentation and

31 U tom pogledu bismo još jednom potvrdili stav da je troprostornost, koju možemo pronaći na kompleksima raznih funkcija, manji indikator srodnosti od dijeljenoga razvojnog puta kurije kraj Orahovice i kompleksa u Pomázu koji sugerira sličnost funkcije.

32 *Magna Curia* u Budi bi možda također mogla pokazati sličnost funkcije. Ona je do pred sam kraj vladavine kralja Ludovika I. bila kraljevska rezidencija. Kompleks zgrada bio je organiziran oko dvorišta kojemu se pristupalo kroz ulaznu kulu (Buzás 2015: 9). U scenariju koji bi glavnu zgradu i same začete komplekse kurije kraj Orahovice datirao u drugu polovicu 14. st., kao izgledan arhitektonski uzor mogla bi se pokazati *Magna Curia*. Izgradnje u kraljevskoj organizaciji predstavljale su uzorak po kojemu je aristokracija rado gradila. Uključivanje takve arhitekture u vlastiti prikaz moći u prostoru donosilo je pojedincu ili obitelji značajan prestiž. Nikola Kont, kao jedan od kraljevih najbližih podanika i jedan od najvećih velikaša, a istovremeni vlasnik Orahovice i Várpalote, zasigurno je u isto vrijeme imao i sredstva i odobrenje za takve graditeljske aktivnosti.

31 In that respect, we would like to ascertain that the three-room plan, which can be found in complexes of various functions, is a less important indicator of relatedness than the shared development of the manor house near Orahovica and the complex in Pomáz which suggests similarity of function.

32 *Magna Curia* in Buda could perhaps also exhibit similarities in function. It was royal residence up until the very end of the reign of King Louis I. The building complex was organized around a courtyard which was entered through an entrance tower (Buzás 2015: 9). If we dated the main building and the origin of the complex of the manor house near Orahovica to the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, *Magna Curia* could be a plausible architectural role model. Constructions under the king represented a pattern of the nobility often liked to replicate. Including such architecture in their own display of power in space brought an individual or his family considerable prestige. Nicholas Kont, as one of the king's closest subjects and one of the greatest noblemen, and, at the same time, the owner of Orahovica and Várpalota, surely had the means and approval for such activities.



Sl. 23 Tlocrt vidljivih i istraženih struktura nakon arheoloških istraživanja 2020. godine. Crveno označen zid, zeleno označeni tragovi struktura u umjetno prokopanomome jarku, plavo označene dodatne strukture pretpostavljene na temelju morfologije terena (izradila: V. Gligora; doradio: M. Emić)

Fig. 23 Floorplan of visible and explored structures after archaeological excavations in 2020. Wall marked red, traces of structures in artificial ditch marked green, additional structures assumed on the basis of terrain morphology marked blue (made by: V. Gligora; supplemented by: M. Emić)

funkciju. Izvjesno je da ćemo i u kuriji kraj Orahovice pronaći mješavinu stambeno-representativne te gospodarsko-administrativne uloge. Ipak, tek će ispravna dokumentacija i interpretacija stratigrafije omogućiti razumijevanje arhitektonskoga razvoja te funkciju pojedinih prostorija (Janeš 2018: 129). Mladen Radić navodi mogućnost da je u ovome objektu boravila neka obiteljska grana ili rođaci Iločkih, plemići Orahovički (Radić 2014: 74). U 20-im i 30-im godinama 15. st. vidljiva je velika zamršenost po pitanju vlasništva nad Orahovičkim posjedom.<sup>33</sup> Upravo bi

33 U literaturi se 1430-e često opisuju kao prigušeno razdoblje u povijesti roda Iločkih i Orahovičkih (Andrić 2008: 88). Kao što je prethodno spomenuto, Nikola Kont je tijekom svoga života stekao brojne posjede. Tako je 1350. godine, dok je u vlasništvu imao orahovički posjed, stekao Palotu u Vesprenskoj županiji. Njegovi sinovi, Bartol i Nikola, nisu se puno bavili orahovičkim posjedom već su im važniji bili oni u Njitranskoj i Vesprenskoj županiji (Andrić 2008: 85–86). U sljedećoj generaciji glavni posjed loze postao je Ilok. Orahovica je uglavnom ostala u rukama potomaka Lőkösa Jakobovog, bratića Nikole Konta. Ipak, događaji koji su se odvijali 1403. i 1405. pokazali su da je kaštelana u Orahovici postavljao član loze Nikole Konta, odnosno Iločkih, a ne neki od potomaka Lőkösa Orahovičkog (Andrić 2008: 87). Godine 1417. mačvanski banovi Ladislav i Emerik Iločki izdaju u Orahovici list-

interpretation of stratigraphy will enable the understanding of architectural development and the function of individual rooms (Janeš 2018: 129). Mladen Radić states the possibility that a branch of the House of Ilok or their relatives from the House of Orahovica resided in this structure (Radić 2014: 74). There is a visible complication in the question of the ownership over the Orahovica estate in the 1420s and 1430s.<sup>33</sup> It is precisely

33 In literature, the 1430s are often described as a calm period in the history of the House of Ilok and Orahovica (Andrić 2008: 88). As has been mentioned, Nicholas Kont acquired many estates during his lifetime. In 1350, while possessing the Orahovica estate, he acquired Palota in Veszprém County. His sons, Bartholomew and Nicholas, did not pay much attention to the Orahovica estate; the estates in Nitra and Veszprém counties were more important to them (Andrić 2008: 85–86). Ilok became the main estate of the House in the next generation. Orahovica remained mostly in the hands of the descendants of Lőkös of Jacob, Nicholas Kont's cousin. Still, the events taking place in 1403 and 1405 revealed that the castellan in Orahovica was appointed by a member of Nicholas Kont's line, i.e. someone from the House of Ilok, and not any of the descendants of Lőkös of Orahovica (Andrić 2008: 87). In 1417, Bans of Macsó, Ladislaus and Emerik of Ilok, issued a document in Orahovica. Three years later, Gregory Stephen of Orahovica also issued a document in Orahovica. In 1422, Ladislaus of Ilok's widow moved her

mogućnost koju Radić navodi, ili neka slična komplicirana vlasnička situacija, mogla objasniti zašto je kurija izgrađena samo osamstotinjak metara od Ružice grada. Kao element koji je mogao igrati ulogu u izgradnji kurije treba naglasiti činjenicu da je, nakon smrti svoga muža, Ana, majka Nikole Iločkog, dugi niz godina upravljala orahovičkim posjedom. Prema običajnom pravu koje je popisao István Werbőczy 1514. godine, udovice se nije smjelo isključiti iz korištenja posjeda i kuća svojih pokojnih muževa, osim ako je riječ o utverdama koje im se nije smjelo predati, već je za njih trebala biti određena neka druga rezidencija izvan utvrde (Fügedi 1986: 61). Također, majka se sve do svoje preudaje smatrala zakonitim tutorom svoje djece (Kekez 2012: 232). Zbog toga je ona dugi niz godina, sve dok Nikola nije preuzeo vlast, upravljala orahovičkim posjedom. Stoga, postoji mogućnost da je prema običajnom pravu udovica Ana kao vlastitu rezidenciju posjedovala kuriju ispod Ružice grada.

Na nekim primjerima sličnih rezidencija vidljivo je da su kasnija zdanja podignuta na mjestu prvotnih, oskudnijih i često drvenih, objekata. Iako nalazi zasad to još ne potvrđuju, najbliže analogije u Várpaloti i Kisdáni otvaraju mogućnost izgradnje kurije kraj Orahovice na samome kraju 14. st. Također, kod brojnih su rezidencija kamene nadogradnje, koje su nastajale u kasnijim fazama, mijenjale ranije drvene gospodarske zgrade. Analogije ulomaka oboda kuhinjske keramike ukazuju na potencijalno široko vremensko prisustvo ljudskoga djelovanja od 14. do 17. st. Analogije ulomaka oboda stolne keramike preciziraju to prisustvo u 15. i prvu polovicu 16. st. dok ga *quarting* Žigmunda Luksemburškog sa sigurnošću potvrđuje u drugu trećinu 15. st. Gabor Virágos razlikuje nukleizirane od raspršenih rezidencija. U raspršenom rezidencijalnom kompleksu stambena zgrada, crkva ili kapela, poljoprivredne i ostale zgrade mogle su međusobno biti odvojene i do nekoliko stotina metara. S vremenom je trend išao od raspršenih prema nukleiziranim rezidencijama (Virágos 2006: 125–126). To znači da je kurija, iako se u prvoj fazi gradnje može prepoznati samo glavna zgrada, mogla, kao raspršeni kompleks, imati iste funkcije kao i u kasnijim fazama kada su određene aktivnosti nadogradnjom novih zidanih objekata na kuriju približene samome sjedištu posjeda. Odnosno, nije nužno da je kasniji „složeni“ rezidencijalno-gospodarski kompleks prvotno bio samo „jednostavan“ objekt. Prema navedenom se modelu moglo u kasnijim fazama sve djelatnosti približiti kuriji i eventualno ju ograditi oko središnjega dvorišta zbog određene opasnosti, nestabilnosti, daljnje distanciranja plemstva od puka ili drugih faktora. Chris King smatra da je zatvoreno dvorište bilo ključno za hijerarhijsku podjelu prostora u kurijama – ono je ujedinjavalo različite elemente kućanstva, pritom

inu. Tri godine kasnije Grgur Stjepanov Orahovički također u Orahovici izdaje listinu. Godine 1422. udovica Ladislava Iločkog premješta svoga familijara Emerica Simonyija sa službe orahovičkog kaštelana na službu kaštelana u Hlohovecu. Pet godina kasnije spominju se Nikola Lőköseve i Grgur Stjepanov Orahovički, a od 1428. u izvorima više ne nalazimo članove Lőköseve loze Orahovičkih. Tek se trideset godina kasnije, nakon što se posebnoj lozi Orahovičkih u poznatim vrelima izgubio trag, pojavljuje Ladislav Orahovički, mačvanski ban (Andrić 2008: 89).

the possibility that Radić states, or some similar complicated ownership situation, that could explain why the manor house was built only about 800 m away from Ružica grad. The fact that Ana, the mother of Nicholas of Ilok, managed the Orahovica estate for a long time after her the death of her husband should be noted as an element that could have played a role in the construction of the manor house. According to István Werbőczy's Hungarian Customary Law from 1514, widows were not to be excluded from using the estates and houses of their late husbands, except castles, which were not to be given to them, but had to be replaced by some other residence outside the castle (Fügedi 1986: 61). In addition, the mother was considered the legal tutor of her children until her remarriage (Kekez 2012: 232). Due to that, she managed the Orahovica estate for many years, until Nicholas took power. Therefore, there is a possibility that, according to the Customary Law, widow Ana owned the manor house beneath Ružica grad as her residence.

In some examples of similar residences, it is visible that later structures were constructed where the first ones, more modest and often wooden, used to be. Although the findings do not yet confirm this, the closest analogies in Várpalota and Kisdána offer the possibility of the manor house near Orahovica being built at the very end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Likewise, in many residences, stone additions, built in later phases, replaced earlier wooden service and agricultural buildings. Analogies of the kitchenware rim fragments point to a potential long period of human presence from the 14<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century. Analogies of tableware rim fragments narrow down the human presence to the 15<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, while Sigismund of Luxembourg's *quarting* confirms it in the second third of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Gabor Virágos distinguishes between nucleated and dispersed residences. In a dispersed residential complex, the residence, church or chapel, agricultural and other buildings could be separated from each other by up to several hundred meters. With time, the trend shifted towards nucleated residences (Virágos 2006: 125–126). Therefore, although only the main building could be recognized in the first construction phase, the manor house as a dispersed complex could have the same functions as in later phases when certain activities were brought closer to the centre of the estate by adding new stone structures to the manor house. i.e. the later “complicated” residential and economic complex was not necessarily a “simple” structure at first. According to this model, all activities could be brought closer to the manor house in later phases and possibly enclosed around the central courtyard due to certain danger, instability, further distancing of the nobility from the commoners or other factors. Chris King believes that the enclosed courtyard was crucial for the hierarchical division of the space in manor houses – it united different elements of the household while retaining differences

retainer Emeric Simonyi from his post of Orahovica castellan to the post of Hlohovec castellan. Five years later, Nicholas of Lőkös and Gregory Stephen of Orahovica are mentioned, and from 1428 onwards, we do not find any of the members of the Lőkös's branch of the Orahovica family in sources. Only thirty year later, after the trace of this special branch of the Orahovica family was lost in known written sources, Ladislav of Orahovica, Ban of Macsó appeared (Andrić 2008: 89).

zadržavajući razlike među njima. Također je omogućavalo nadzor i kontrolu nad kretanjem članova kućanstva te posjetitelja (King 2003: 113). Evidentno je da je kroz srednji vijek aristokracija s vremenom postala sve više prostorno izolirana u krajoliku, ali i unutar vlastitih rezidencija (Hansson 2009: 442). Gabor Virágos je tu promjenu u slučajevima Kisdána i Pomáza prepoznao u izgradnji zidina koje nisu imale veliku vojnu važnost, ali su omogućile distanciranje.

Osim bliske povezanosti s naseljem još jedan sastavni element proučavanih rezidencija je bliska povezanost s obližnjom crkvom. Kod nekih primjera crkva je udaljena par desetaka ili stotina metara od rezidencije, dok su neki primjeri, poput Várpalote, Kisdána i Pomáza, udaljeni do dvadesetak metara od crkve koja je u kasnijim fazama inkorporirana u kompleks.<sup>34</sup> U kasnosrednjovjekovnoj Ugarskoj razvoj je išao u skladu s tendencijama vidljivima diljem Europe – nove crkve gradile su se u blizini vlastelinstava (Virágos 2006: 124). Trend se jednostavno objašnjava činjenicom da je religijska dimenzija gotovo uvijek prisutna u prostornome konceptu plemstva (Hansson 2009: 443). Zbog toga je ugarski plemić u pravilu imao privatnu crkvu ili je župnu crkvu spojio sa svojom rezidencijom (Virágos 2006: 124). Patroni srednjovjekovnih crkva voljeli su ostvariti privatni pristup liturgiji (Nagy 2015: 15).<sup>35</sup> Ako se pak unutar ili u blizini kompleksa ne nalazi crkva, često postoji mala kapela spojena s rezidencijom jer je plemić uvijek bio blizu mjesta štovanja (Hansson 2009: 443).<sup>36</sup> Položaj srednjovjekovne župne crkve u Orahovici, kao i titulari dvorske kapele i župne crkve, nisu još najbolje razjašnjeni.<sup>37</sup> Zbog toga je važno napomenuti da je na karti prve vojne izmjere Habsburške Monarhije 600-tinjak metara zapadno od oznake *Rudera major*, koja odgovara smještaju ostataka kurije, ucrtana crkva (karta 2). Szabolcs Varga navodi da je franjevački samostan u Voćinu, nakon što je Orahovica 1494. godine pretrpjela znatna oštećenja, s vremenom postao rodovsko mjesto ukopa Iločkih (Varga 2013: 64). Nikola i Lovro Iločki sahranjeni su u franjevačkoj crkvi sv. Ivana Kapistrana u Iloku (Ivović, Kunčić 2019: 179). Prema Varginoj tvrdnji mogli bismo zaključiti da je prethodno mjesto ukopa dijela roda bila Orahovica. U tome slučaju vjerojatno je riječ o članovima roda između Nikole Konta<sup>38</sup> i Nikole Iločkog ili o grani obitelji Orahovički. Važnu ulogu u vjerskome životu vlasnika orahovičkoga posjeda igrala je sigurno i crkva u današnjem selu Crkvari koja je bila u

between them. It also enabled surveillance and control over the circulation of household members and visitors (King 2003: 113). Evidently, during the Middle Ages, the aristocracy became evermore spatially isolated in the landscape, but also within their residences (Hansson 2009: 442). Gabor Virágos recognized that change in Kisdána and Pomáz in the construction of the walls that had no great military importance but did enable distancing.

Aside from the close connection with the settlement, the close connection to the nearby church is another integral aspect of the studied residences. In some examples, the church is a few tens or hundreds of metres away from the residence, while some examples, such as Várpalota, Kisdána, and Pomáz, are some twenty metres away from the church, which was incorporated in the complex in later phases.<sup>34</sup> In medieval Hungary, the development was in line with tendencies visible all across Europe – new churches were built near manors (Virágos 2006: 124). The trend is explained by the fact that the religious dimension is almost always present in the spatial concept of the nobility (Hansson 2009: 443). Due to that, Hungarian noblemen usually had a private church or they connected the parish churches to their residences (Virágos 2006: 124). Patrons of medieval churches liked having private access to liturgy (Nagy 2015: 15).<sup>35</sup> If the church is not within or in the vicinity of the complex, there is often a small chapel connected to the residence, because noblemen were always close to a place of worship (Hansson 2009: 443).<sup>36</sup> The position of the medieval parish church in Orahovica, as well as the titles of the chapel and parish church is still not ascertained.<sup>37</sup> Therefore, it is important to note that the map of the first Habsburg military survey shows a church around 600 metres west from *Rudera major* that corresponds to the position of the manor house (Map 2). Szabolcs Varga mentions that the Franciscan monastery in Voćin, after Orahovica was significantly damaged in 1494, eventually became the place of burial of the House of Ilok (Varga 2013: 64). Nicholas and Lawrence of Ilok were buried in the Franciscan church of St. John of Capistrano in Ilok (Ivović, Kunčić 2019: 179). Based on Varga's claim, we could conclude that an earlier burial place of some members of the House of Ilok was Orahovica. In that case, those are the members between Nicholas Kont<sup>38</sup> and Nicholas of Ilok or a branch of the House of Orahovica. The church in today's village of Crkvari, used when the Counts of Ilok ruled the nearby

34 U Várpaloti je samo par metara sjeverno od zida troprostorne zgrade pronađen južni zid kapele izgrađen u isto vrijeme (Gergelyffy 1967: 268).

35 Patronatsko pravo nad crkvenom institucijom donosilo je razne dobiti, među ostalim i pravo ukopa unutar crkve ili odmah uz nju (Jekely 2018: 104).

36 U Ugarskoj su privatne kapele gradili samo pripadnici najvišeg društvenog sloja, prvenstveno u utvrdama (Virágos 2006: 124). *Magna Curia* u Budi, korištena tijekom vladavine kralja Ludovika I., od početka je sadržavala kapelu sv. Martina (Buzás 2015: 9).

37 Jedini zasad poznati srednjovjekovni spomen titulara crkve u Orahovici je neobjavljeni dokument požeškog kaptola iz 1404. godine, koji spominje crkvu sv. Katarine (Andrić 2008: 101).

38 Nikola Kont je sahranjen u pavlinskom samostanu u Csatki u Vesprenskoj županiji (Andrić 2008: 85).

34 In Várpalota, only a few meters north of the wall of the three-room building, a southern wall of the chapel built at the same period was discovered (Gergelyffy 1967: 268).

35 Patronage over a church institution brought the patron multiple benefits; among others, the right of being buried within the church or right next to it (Jekely 2018: 104).


36 In Hungary, private chapels were built only by the members of the highest social stratum, mostly in castles (Virágos 2006: 124). *Magna Curia* in Buda, used during the reign of King Louis I contained the chapel of St. Marin from the start (Buzás 2015: 9).

37 The only medieval mention of the title of the Orahovica church known at this point is an unpublished document of Požega chapter from 1404, mentioning the Church of St. Catherine (Andrić 2008: 101).

38 Nicholas Kont was buried in the Pauline Monastery in Csatka in Veszprém County (Andrić 2008: 85).

funkciji u vremenu gospodarenja knezova Iločkih nedalekom Ružicom (Tkalčec 2014: 79). Ona se u srednjem vijeku nalazila na posjedu Jošava koji je većinu vremena bio dio orahovičkoga vlastelinstva (Andrić 2019: 280). Sustavna arheološka istraživanja pokazala su da je ranogotička jednobrodna dvoranska crkva, na vrhuncu svoje graditeljske faze proširena u veliku trobrodnu gotičku crkva sa snažnim zvonikom na zapadnome pročelju, okruženu dubokim obrambenim jarkom (Tkalčec 2016b: 162).

Ružica, surely played an important role in the religious life of the owners of the Orahovica estate (Tkalčec 2014: 79). In the Middle Ages, it was situated on Jošava estate, which was a part of the Orahovica estate most of the time (Andrić 2019: 280). Systematic archaeological excavations revealed that the single-nave early Gothic hall church turned into a large three-nave Gothic church at the height of the construction phase, with a strong bell tower in the western façade, surrounded by a deep defensive ditch (Tkalčec 2016b: 162).



Karta 2 Karta Prve austrijske vojne izmjere. Crveno označeni položaj kurije (Rudera majur) i simbol crkve nedaleko od nje (kartografska osnova: MAPIRE; doradio: M. Emić)

Map 2 Map of the First Habsburg military survey. Position of the manor house (Rudera majur) marked red with the marked symbol of the church nearby (map base: MAPIRE; supplemented by: M. Emić)

Naposljetku, interesantnim ostaje i spomen druge kurije. Kao što je već navedeno, Szabo je pronašao i ukratko opisao kuriju koja je predmet ovoga rada, ali navodi da je „sasvim iščezao trag“ druge jer ju on nije uspio pronaći (Szabo 1914: 94). Jedino se kombiniranjem usustavljenih parametara koji najbolje odgovaraju pozicioniranju kurije, koji će se morati temeljiti na rezultatima istraživanja kurije ispod Ružice grada te terenskim pregledom dolova, odnosno nizina potoka i rječica, otvara mogućnost pronalaska druge kurije. Osim pronalaska druge kurije, pažnju treba posvetiti pronalasku ostalih kurija u Slavoniji. U ispravi izdanoj u Budimu 1432. godine palatin Nikola II. Gorjanski ishodio je dogovor o diobi brojne nepokretne imovine između svojih sinova Nikole i Ladislava te njega samoga (Andrić 2001: 102). Tom prilikom saznaje se za kurije u Vrbovi, Gradištu i Dubovcu u požeškoj županiji, Horvátiju te Nagyfaluu u vukovskoj županiji, Našicama u baranjskoj

Finally, the mention of the other manor house is also interesting. As has already been mentioned, Szabo discovered and briefly depicted the manor house analysed in this paper, but stated that “the trace [of the other manor house] has completely vanished” because he had not managed to find it (Szabo 1914: 94). Only the combination of systematized parameters which suit the positioning of manor house the best, that will have to be based on the research of the manor house beneath Ružica grad, and field surveys of the valleys, i.e. creek and river valleys, will open the possibility of discovering the other manor house. Aside from the discovering of the other manor house, attention should be paid to discovering other manor houses in Slavonia. In a document issued in Buda in 1432, palatine Nicholas II Garai secured an agreement on the division of immense immovable assets between his sons Nicholas and Ladislaus and himself (Andrić 2001: 102). The document reveals the existence of manor houses in Vrbova,

županiji, Újlaku kod Gorjana te u mjestima *Azaryas*, *Porva*, *Saragh* i na nekim vlastelinstvima u drugim dijelovima kraljevstva (Andrić 2001: 103). Dakle, ovdje je riječ samo o kurijama koje su se 1432. godine nalazile u posjedu obitelji Gorjanski. Nesumnjivo je gusta mreža kurija prekrivala međuriječje Drave, Dunava i Save.

## ZAKLJUČAK

Kurija kraj Orahovice je prva kurija na kojoj su, na području današnje Slavonije, poduzeta arheološka istraživanja. Pokretni arheološki nalazi ukazuju na potencijalno korištenje prostora kroz više stoljeća, ali se ono zasad sa sigurnošću može potvrditi samo u 15. st. U istraživačkoj kampanji 2020. godine započeto je istraživanje jedne od prostorija glavne zgrade kurije koje je zbog određenih tehničkih poteškoća prethodno bilo nemoguće. Nastavak istraživanja na tome području, kao i u drugim dijelovima kurije, trebao bi uroditi brojnim vrijednim nalazima koji će omogućiti pravilnu valorizaciju ovoga lokaliteta. Povijest orahovičkoga posjeda na kojemu se kurija nalazila, ukazuje na neke od najvećih velikaša kasnosrednjovjekovne hrvatske povijesti. Ružica grad, koji se nalazi nedaleko iznad kurije, sam je po sebi svjedok iznimne važnosti ovoga područja u kasnome srednjem vijeku. Istraživanje kuriji sličnih rezidencija na području Ugarskoga Kraljevstva sugerira potencijalan specifičan položaj ovoga kompleksa unutar velikoga orahovičkog posjeda. Daljnja istraživanja potvrdit će ili opovrgnuti postojanje složenosti rezidencijalnih i gospodarskih karakteristika u sklopu kurije pretpostavljenih u ovome radu. U slučaju da se u budućnosti potvrdi postojanje složenoga rezidencijalno-gospodarskog kompleksa, daljnja istraživanja omogućit će otkrivanje brojnih sastavnica svakodnevnoga života u srednjem vijeku i dobivanje slike jedne specifične plemićke rezidencije kakva još nije poznata u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj.

## ZAHVALE

Ovom prilikom zahvaljujem cijenjenom kolegi Andreju Janešu, dipl. arheologu, na pomoći i savjetima u radu te davanju mogućnosti da kurija kraj Orahovice bude predmet ovoga istraživanja. Hvala i dr. sc. Tatjani Tkalčec na brojnim korisnim savjetima pri pisanju rada. Naslov diplomskoga rada je „Plemićka kurija kraj Ružice grada u Orahovici – Analiza materijala do 2019. godine te interpretacija namjene kurije.“ Rad je napisan pod mentorstvom dr. sc. Ane Azinović Bebek, a u povjerenstvu su se nalazili dr. sc. Krešimir Filipec te mag. archeol. Jana Škrkulja. Rad je obranjen 24. 09. 2020. godine na Filozofskome fakultetu u Zagrebu. Ovom bih prilikom još jednom zahvalio mentorici dr. sc. Ani Azinović Bebek na iznimnome i predanome mentorstvu.

Gradište, and Dubovac in Požega County, Horváti and Nagyfal in Vukovo County, Našice in Baranya County, Újlak near Gorjani and in settlements of *Azaryas*, *Porva*, *Saragh*, and some estates in other parts of the Kingdom (Andrić 2001: 103). Therefore, these are only the manor houses owned by the Garai family in 1432. There is no doubt that there was a dense network of manor houses between the rivers of Drava, Danube, and Sava.

## CONCLUSION

The manor house near Orahovica is the first archaeologically excavated manor house in present-day Slavonia. Movable finds point to the potential use of the place throughout several centuries, but, for now, it can be confirmed with certainty only in the 15<sup>th</sup> century. During the excavation campaign of 2020, research of one of the rooms of the main building of the manor house started, which was previously impossible due to certain technical problems. The continuation of research in that area, as well as in other parts of the manor house, should yield numerous valuable finds which will enable a proper valorisation of this site. The history of the Orahovica estate, where the manor house was situated, points to some of the greatest noblemen of medieval Croatian history. Ružica grad, situated close to and above the manor house, is in itself a witness to the exceptional importance of this area in the late Middle Ages. Research into similar manor houses in the area of the Kingdom of Hungary suggests a potential specific position of this complex within the large Orahovica estate. Further research will confirm or disprove the existence of complicated residential and economic characteristics as parts of the manor house, assumed in this paper. In case the existence of a complicated residential and economic complex is confirmed in the future, further research will enable revealing multiple components of everyday life in the Middle Ages and provide us with an image of a specific aristocratic residence, thus far unknown in continental Croatia.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my esteemed colleague Andrej Janeš for all his help and advice in my work, as well as the opportunity to use the manor house near Orahovica as the subject of my research. I would also like to thank Tatjana Tkalčec, PhD, for her ample advice regarding this paper. The title of the thesis is, “Manor house near Ružica grad in Orahovica – Analysis of the material discovered until 2019 and the interpretation of the function of the manor house.” It was mentored by Ana Azinović Bebek, PhD, and the thesis defence committee was comprised of Krešimir Filipec, PhD, and Jana Škrkulja, mag. archeol. It was defended on 24 September 2020 at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. I would like to thank my mentor Ana Azinović Bebek, PhD, for her exceptional and devoted mentorship.

Prijevod / Translation  
Kristina Deskar  
Lektura / Proofreading  
Marko Maras

## INTERNETSKI IZVORI / INTERNET SOURCES

Geoportal DGU – <https://geoportal.dgu.hr/> (pristupljeno 03. 07. 2021.)  
 MAPIRE – Historical Maps Online, Arcanum Database Ltd., Budapest,  
<https://mapire.eu/en/> (pristupljeno 03. 07. 2021.)


## LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrić, S. 2001, *Potonuli svijet. Rasprave o slavonskom i srijemskom srednjovjekovlju*, Hrvatski institut za povijest – Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje, Slavonski Brod.
- Andrić, S. 2008, Podgorje Papuka i Krndije u srednjem vijeku: prilozi za lokalnu povijest (prvi dio), *Scrinia Slavonica*, Vol. 8(1), 55–112.
- Andrić, S. 2019, Sjeveroistočna Hrvatska, in: *Vrijeme sazrijevanja, vrijeme razaranja – Hrvatske zemlje u kasnome srednjem vijeku*, Karbić M. (ed.), *Povijest Hrvata III*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 255–304.
- Andrić, S., Radić, M., 2004, Povijest srednjovjekovnog grada Ružice, in: Radić, M., Božić, Z. 2004, *Srednjovjekovni grad Ružica*, katalog izložbe, Muzej Slavonije, Osijek, 7–18.
- Barz, D. 1993, Das „Feste Haus“ – ein früher Bautyp der Adelsburg, *Burgen und Schlösser - Zeitschrift für Burgenforschung und Denkmalpflege*, Vol. 34(1), 10–24. <https://doi.org/10.11588/bus.1993.1.73911>
- Bekić, L. 2010, Srednjovjekovna jama K 12 s nalazišta Jelkovec – Police kod Varaždina, *Archaeologia Adriatica*, Vol. 4(1), 227–241.
- Beusan, M. 2005, Novi Dvori Cesargradski i Novi Dvori Jelačićevi u funkciji razvoja kulturnog turizma, in: *Zbornik radova. Međunarodni znanstveno-stručni skup Suvremeno korištenje i kreativno upravljanje dvorcima, kurijama i ljetnikovcima, Zagreb, 2005 / Conference proceedings. International conference Contemporary use and creative management of manors, castles and villas, Zagreb, 2005*, Obad Ščitaroci M., Božić N. (eds.), Arhitektonski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 219–223.
- Bikić, V. 2003, *Gradska keramika Beograda (16–17. vek) / Belgrade ceramics in the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> century*, Posebna izdanja 39, Arheološki institut, Beograd.
- Buzás, G. 2001, Szabályos alaprajzú várpaloták mint az uralkodói hatalom jelképei a XIV–XV. században, in: „Kard és koszorú”. Ezer év magyar uralmi és katonai jelképei, Hausner G., Kincses K. M., Veszprémy L. (eds.), *A Hadtörténeti Múzeum Értéktárája 4*, Hadtörténeti Múzeum, Budapest, 53–57.
- Buzás, G. 2015, Királyi rezidenciák és szálláshelyek a késő középkori Magyarországon, in: *Medio Regni Hungariae. Régészeti, művészettörténeti és történeti kutatások 'az ország közepén' / Archaeological, Art Historical, and Historical Research 'in the Middle of the Kingdom'*, Benkő E., Orosz K. (eds.), Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Budapest, 705–723.
- Chotěbor, P., Smetánka, Z. 1985, Panské dvory na české středověké vesnici, *Archaeologia historica*, Vol. 10, 47–56.
- Cosnean Nistor, L. 2017, Introduction, in: *Palaces, Castles, and Manor Houses of Medieval and Early Modern Times 1*, Cosnean Nistor L., Burichioiu I. (eds.), *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series historica* 21(1), Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918”, Alba Iulia, 7–12.
- Čaplovič, D., Hrubec, I., Ruttkay A., Vallašek A. 1985, Stredoveké feudálne sídla na Slovensku a ich hospodárske zázemie, *Archaeologia historica*, Vol. 10, 241–254.
- Čikara, D. 2017, From a Hypothesis on the development of the layout of Poklek Manor in Zagorska Sela, towards a hitherto Unknown Type of Residential Architecture in Continental Croatia, *Ars & Humanitas: revija za umetnost in humanistiko / Journal of Arts and Humanities*, Vol. XI(1), 171–188. <https://doi.org/10.4312/ars.11.1.171-188>
- Čikara, D. 2019, Single space manor houses in the context of defense and possible genesis of the post-medieval nobility countryside architecture in NW Croatia, in: *Fortifications, defence systems, structures and features in the past / Fortifikacije, obrambeni sustavi i strukture u prošlosti*, Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Scientific Conference on Mediaeval Archaeology of the Institute of Archaeology Zagreb, 7<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup> June 2017, Tkalčec T., Sekelj Ivančan T., Krznar T., Belaj J. (eds.), *Zbornik Instituta za arheologiju / Serta Instituti Archaeologici* 13, Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb, 381–392.
- Emić, M. 2020, *Plemićka kurija kraj Ružice grada u Orahovici. Analiza materijala do 2019. godine te interpretacija namjene kurije*, Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Zagreb, Zagreb.
- Feld, I. 2004, Herrschaft, Burg und Residenz im spätmittelalterlichen Königreich Ungarn, in: *Burgen und Siedlungsstruktur*, Ruttkay A., Ruttkay M., Bednár P. (eds.), *Castrum bene 7*, Archaeologický ústav SAV, Nitra, 47–78.
- Feld, I. 2018, Castles, Mansions, and Manor Houses in Medieval Hungary, in: *The Art of Medieval Hungary*, Barral i Altet X., Lövei P., Lucherini V., Takács I. (eds.), *Bibliotheca Academiae Hungariae – Roma Studia* 7, Viella, Roma, 117–130.
- Fügedi, E. 1986, *Castle and society in medieval Hungary (1000-1437)*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Gergelyffy, A. 1967, A Várpalotai var epitesi korszakai I., *A Veszprém megyei múzeumok közleményei*, Vol. 6, 259–278.
- Gergelyffy, A. 1970, Palota es Castrum Palota, in: *Magyar műemlékvédelem 1967–1968*, Hantos L. (ed.), Országos Műemléki Felügyelőség Kiadványai 5, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 125–144.
- Gergelyffy, A. 1972, Bátorkő és Palota. A várpalotai vár építési korszakai II., *A Veszprém megyei múzeumok közleményei*, Vol. 11, 243–258.
- Guštin, M. 2001, Celjske čaše / Die Tonbecher vom Typ Celje, in: *Srednjeveško Celje / Medieval Celje*, Guštin M. (ed.), *Archaeologica historica Slovenica* 3, Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za arheologijo, Ljubljana, 139–193.
- Hansson, M. 2009, The medieval aristocracy and the social use of space, in: *Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology, 1957–2007*, Gilchrist R., Reynolds A. (eds.), *Society for medieval archaeology monographs* 30, Routledge, London, 435–452. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315089034>
- Hejna, A. 1977, Opevněná venkovská sídla doby přemyslovské v Čechách. Výsledky archeologického výzkumu z období 1965–1975, *Archaeologia historica*, Vol. 2, 69–79.
- Hejna, A. 1978, Drobná opevněná sídla v Čechách a jejich místo v sídlitním vývoji 10.–13. století, *Archaeologia historica*, Vol. 3, 75–82.
- Holl, I. 1958, Középkori kályhacsempék Magyarországon I. Az udvari központok műhelyei és hatásuk a vidéki fazekasságra (XIV. század–XV. század közepe), *Budapest Régiségei – A Budapesti történeti múzeum Évkönyve*, Vol. XVIII, 211–300.
- Holl, I. 2005, Tischgerät im spätmittelalterlichen Buda. Archäologische Angaben und deren Schranken, *Acta archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, Vol. 56(1–3), 311–384. <https://doi.org/10.1556/aarch.56.2005.1-3.10>
- Horvat, Z. 1994, Grijanje u srednjovjekovnim burgovima kontinentalne Hrvatske. Kamini, dimnjaci i kaljeve peći, *Prostor: znanstveni časopis za arhitekturu i urbanizam*, Vol. 2(3–4), 215–240.
- Horvat, Z. 1999, Kapele u burgovima 13.–15. stoljeća u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj, *Prostor: znanstveni časopis za arhitekturu i urbanizam*, Vol. 7(2), 181–198.
- Horvat, Z. 2002, Analiza srednjovjekovne faze gradnje dvorca Odescalchi, nekadašnjeg palasa Nikole Iločkog, kralja Bosne / Analyse der mittelalterlichen Bauphase des Schlosses Odescalchi in Ilok, des ehemaligen Palastes von N. Iločki, des Königes von Bosnien, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu*, Vol. 19, 195–212.
- Horvat, Z. 2009, Stambeni prostori u burgovima 13.–15. stoljeća u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj, *Prostor: znanstveni časopis za arhitekturu i urbanizam*, Vol. 17(1), 32–51.
- Horvat-Levaj, K. 2015, *Barokna arhitektura*, Povijest umjetnosti u Hrvatskoj, Naklada Ljevak, Zagreb.
- Horváth, R. 2015, Pogranična protuturska obrana i njezine organizacijske promjene u doba Matijaša, in: *Prekretnice u suživotu Hrvata i Mađara. Ustanove, društvo, gospodarstvo i kultura / A horvát-magyar együttélés fordulópontjai. Intézmények, társadalom, gazdaság, kultúra*, Fodor P., Šokčević D. (eds.), MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, Hrvatski institut za povijest, Budapest, 573–581.
- Ivović, S., Kunčić, M. 2019, Intelektualni i kulturni razvoj, in: *Vrijeme sazrijevanja, vrijeme razaranja – Hrvatske zemlje u kasnome srednjem vijeku*, Karbić M. (ed.), *Povijest Hrvata III*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 179–211.

- Janeš, A. 2017, *Izvjestaj o probnom arheološkom iskapanju srednjovjekovne plemićke kurije (curia nobilitaris) kod Orahovice*, Zagreb (neobjavljeni rukopis pohranjen u Hrvatskom restauratorskom zavodu, Služba za arheološku baštinu).
- Janeš, A. 2018, The archaeological approach and the need for medieval castle research, in: *Papers and Proceedings of the Third Medieval Workshop in Rijeka*, Jovanović K., Miljan S. (eds.), Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci, Rijeka, 109–130.
- Janeš, A. 2019, *Orahovica, srednjovjekovna plemićka kurija (curia nobilitaris) – Izvjestaj o arheološkim istraživanjima u 2019. godini*, Zagreb (neobjavljeni rukopis pohranjen u Hrvatskom restauratorskom zavodu, Služba za arheološku baštinu).
- Janeš, A., Hirschler Marić, I. 2019, The transformation of rural settlements in Slavonia in the period from the 12<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, in: *Settlement change across medieval Europe. Old paradigms and new vistas*, Brady N., Theune C. (eds.), Rurality XII, Sidestone Press, Leiden, 383–394.
- Janeš, A., Hirschler Marić, I., Azinović Bebek, A. 2017, Stari Perkovci-Sela, ruralno naselje 14. stoljeća, in: *Srednjovjekovna naselja u svjetlu arheoloških izvora / Mediaeval Settlements in the Light of Archaeological Sources*, Zbornik radova drugog međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa srednjovjekovne arheologije Instituta za arheologiju Zagreb, 2. – 3. lipnja 2015, Zbornik Instituta za arheologiju / Serta Instituti Archaeologici 6, Sekelj Ivančan T., Tkalčec T., Krznar S., Belaj J. (eds.), Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb, 337–388.
- Jekely, Z. 2018, Expansions to the Countryside: Rural Architecture in medieval Hungary, in: *The Art of Medieval Hungary*, Barral i Altet X., Lóvei P., Lucherini V., Takács I. (eds.), Bibliotheca Academiae Hungariae – Roma Studia 7, Viella, Roma, 99–122.
- Kekez, H. 2012, *Plemićki rod Babonića do kraja 14. stoljeća*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Zagreb.
- King, C. 2003, The Organization of Social Space in Late Medieval Manor Houses: an East Anglian Study, *Archaeological Journal*, Vol. 160(1), 104–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00665983.2003.11078171>
- Koppány, T. 1993, *A Balaton környékének műemlékei*, Művészettörténet – műemlékvédelem III, Országos Műemlékvédelmi Hivatal, Budapest.
- Krmpotić, M. 2014a, Kasnosrednjovjekovno i novovjekovno keramičko posuđe, in: *Stari grad Barilović. 10 godina arheoloških istraživanja*, Azinović Bebek A., Krmpotić M. (eds.), Hrvatski restauratorski zavod, Općina Barilović, Zagreb, 76–91.
- Krmpotić, M. 2014b, Pečnjaci, in: *Stari grad Barilović. 10 godina arheoloških istraživanja*, Azinović Bebek A., Krmpotić M. (eds.), Hrvatski restauratorski zavod, Općina Barilović, Zagreb, 92–95.
- László, C. 2006, A várpalotai 14. századi „palota”, in: *Gondolják, látják az várnak nagy voltát... Tanulmányok a 80 éves Nováki Gyula tiszteletére / Burgenkundliche Studien zum 80. Geburtstag von Gyula Nováki*, Kovács G., Miklós Z. (eds.), Castrum Bene Egyesület, Históriaantik Könyvesház Kiadó, Budapest, 163–170.
- Marković, Z., Botić, K. 2017, New Knowledge about the medieval settlements of Našice region, in: *Srednjovjekovna naselja u svjetlu arheoloških izvora / Mediaeval Settlements in the Light of Archaeological Sources*, Zbornik radova drugog međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa srednjovjekovne arheologije Instituta za arheologiju Zagreb, 2. – 3. lipnja 2015, Zbornik Instituta za arheologiju / Serta Instituti Archaeologici 6, Sekelj Ivančan T., Tkalčec T., Krznar S., Belaj J. (eds.), Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb, 483–498.
- Marković, Z., Podunavac, D., Botić, K., Kalafatić, H., Minichreiter, K. 2016, *Čovjek u prostoru i prostor kroz vrijeme. Odnos čovjeka i prostora u svjetlu istraživanja našičkog kraja*, katalog izložbe, Institut za arheologiju, Zavičajni muzej Našice, Zagreb.
- Matijević, M. 2013, Gotičke keramičke čaše iz Rudine, *Radovi Zavoda za znanstveni i umjetnički rad u Požezi*, Vol. 2, 61–86.
- Mažuran, I. 1956, Arheološko iskapanje u Našicama, *Osječki zbornik*, Vol. 5, 95–120.
- Mažuran, I. 2008, *Orahovica (1228.–2008.). Srednjovjekovna tvrđava, utvrđeni dvor, trgovište i grad*, Ogranak Matice hrvatske, Orahovica.
- Menclová, D. 1973, Príspevok k typológii hradov, zámkov a kaštieľov na Slovensku, in: *Hrady, zámky a kaštiele na Slovensku*, PISOŇ Š. (ed.), Osveta, Bratislava, 397–446.
- Měřínský, Z. 1981, Přehled dosavadního stavu výzkumu fortifikaci 11. až počátku 16. století na Moravě a ve Slezsku (hradiska a hrady), *Archaeologia historica*, Vol. 6, 147–197.
- Miljan, S. 2015, *Plemićko društvo zagrebačke županije za vladavine Žigmunda Luksemburškoga (1387.-1437.)*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Zagreb.
- Minichreiter, K., Marković, Z. 2013, *Beketinci Bentež. Naselja iz eneolitika, ranoga i kasnoga srednjega vijeka / Beketinci Bentež. Settlements from the Eneolithic, Early and Late Medieval Period*, Monografije Instituta za arheologiju 3, Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb.
- Nagy, S. B. 2010, A Kompoltiak temploma Kísánánán, in: *Castrum - A Castrum Bene Egyesület Hírlévé*, Feld I. (ed.), Castrum 12 (2010/2), 5–42.
- Nagy, S. B. 2011, A Kompoltiak udvarháza a kiséáni várban, in: *Várak nyomában. Tanulmányok a 60 éves Feld István tiszteletére*, Terei G., Kovács G., Domokos G., Miklós Z., Mordovin M. (eds.), Castrum Bene Egyesület, Civertan Grafikai Stúdió, Budapest, 161–168.
- Nagy, S. B. 2015, *Architectural prestige representation in the mid-fifteenth century: Nicholas Újlaki and the castle of Várpalota*, Unpublished MA Thesis, Central European University, Budapest.
- Nagy, S. B. 2017, Fashionable Courts – Courtly Fashions. Representation in the Architecture of Late Medieval Hungarian Castle Courtyards, *Hungarian Archaeology*, Vol. 2017 Spring, 1–10.
- Pálosfalvi, T. 2014, *The noble elite in the country of Körös (Križevci) 1400–1526*, Monumenta hungariae historica. Dissertationes, MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, Budapest.
- Petrić, H. 2007, O nekim aspektima odnosa gospodarstva, ljudi i okoliša u sjevernom dijelu Križevačke županije i Varaždinskog generalata (Podravini) tijekom 17. stoljeća, *Podravina: časopis za multidisciplinarna istraživanja*, Vol. 6(11), 47–87.
- Radić, M., Bojčić, Z. 2004, *Srednjovjekovni grad Ružica*, katalog izložbe, Muzej Slavonije, Osijek.
- Radić, M. 2014, *Povijest velikaškog roda Iločkih u svijetlu arheoloških istraživanja s osobitim osvrtom na Ružicu-grad i Ilok*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Zagreb.
- Rady, M. 2000, *Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Ruttkay, A. T. 2006, Befestigte Anlagen aus dem 11.-17. Jh. In den ebenen Teilen der Slowakei, in: *Burg und ihr Bauplatz*, Durdík T. (ed.), Castrum bene 9, Archeologický ústav AV ČR, Praha, 377–408.
- Schulman, S., Manninen, M., Luhtala, J., Kemell, L. 2008, *Suitia, rakennushistoriallinen selvitys*, Arkkitehtitoimisto Schulman Oy, Senaati-kiintestöt, Moniste.
- Sekelj Ivančan, T. 2001, *Early Medieval Pottery in Northern Croatia. Typological and chronological pottery analyses as indicators of the settlement of the territory between the rivers Drava and Sava from the 10th to 13th centuries AD*, British Archaeological Report International Series S914, Archaeopress, Oxford.
- Smičklas, T. 1891, *Dvjestogodišnjica oslobodjenja Slavonije. Drugi dio: Spomenici o Slavoniji u XVII. vijeku (1640–1702)*, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb.
- Szabo, G. 1914, Orahovičke gradine, *Viestnik hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva*, Vol. XIII(1913–1914), 94–102.
- Szabo, G. 1920, *Sredovječni gradovi u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji*, Izvanredno izdanje Matice Hrvatske V, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb.
- Szatmari, I. 1985, Későközépkori kályhacsempék nagymágcseről, in: *Régészeti tanulmányok I.*, Fodor I. (ed.), Acta antiqua et archaeologica Supplementum V, József Attila University, Szeged, 55–77.
- Šimek, M. 2012, Keramičke čaše s varaždinskog Staroga grada / Ceramic glasses from Varaždin Old Town, *Archaeologia Adriatica*, Vol. VI(1), 179–206.
- Šiša-Vivek, M. 2012, *Oblici kasnosrednjovjekovnog posuđa na primjeru triju arheološki istraženih sela u Slavoniji*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Zagreb, Zagreb.
- Škiljan, I. 2011, Kasnogotički pečnjaci s Garić-grada, *Radovi zavoda za znanstvenoistraživački i umjetnički rad u Bjelovaru*, Vol. 4, 161–194.
- Škiljan, I. 2015, *Srednjovjekovni i ranonovovjekovni pečnjaci Slavonije*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Zagreb, Zagreb.
- Škiljan, I. 2017, *Toplina doma – Uvod u razvoj pečarstva u srednjovjekovnoj i ranonovovjekovnoj Slavoniji*, katalog izložbe, Muzeji Hrvatskog zagorja.
- Tkalčec, T. 2001, Gotičke keramičke čaše iz Glogovnice i Ivanca Križevačkog kraj Križevaca i Gudovca kraj Bjelovara / Gotische Keramikgefäße aus Glogovnica und Ivanec Križevački bei Križevci und Gudovac bei Bjelovar, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu*, Vol. 18, 213–234.

- Tkalčec, T. 2010a, *Burg Vrbovec u Klenovcu Humskome. Deset sezona arheoloških istraživanja*, Muzeji Hrvatskog Zagorja, Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb.
- Tkalčec, T. 2010b, Kuhinjska i stolna keramika iz stambenog dijela burga Vrbovca u Klenovcu Humskome, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, 3. s. Vol. XLIII, 455–476.
- Tkalčec, T. 2013, Kasnosrednjovjekovno naselje Buzadovec – Vojvodice (AN 3) na trasi autoceste A12 Sveta Helena – GP Gola, *Annales Instituti Archaeologici*, Vol. IX, 76–87.
- Tkalčec, T. 2014, Posljednja sezona sustavnih zaštitnih arheoloških istraživanja nalazišta Crkvari – crkva sv. Lovre 2013. godine, *Annales Instituti Archaeologici*, Vol. X, 73–81.
- Tkalčec, T. 2016a, Prapovijesna, rimska i srednjovjekovna naselja na lokalitetu Donji Miholjac-Đanovci – zaštitna istraživanja u 2015. godini, *Annales Instituti Archaeologici*, Vol. XII, 46–58.
- Tkalčec, T. 2016b, Odabir mjesta za pokop djece u novom vijeku na primjeru Crkvara kod Orahovice, in: *Groblja i pogrebni običaji u srednjem i ranom novom vijeku na prostoru sjeverne Hrvatske*, Zbornik radova prvog međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa srednjovjekovne arheologije Instituta za arheologiju Zagreb, 4. lipnja 2014., Zbornik Instituta za arheologiju / Serta Instituti Archaeologici 4, Krznar S., Sekelj Ivančan T., Tkalčec T., Belaj J. (eds.), Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb, 161–201.
- Tkalčec, T. 2019, Arheološka istraživanja na srednjovjekovnome arheološkom kompleksu Osijek Vojakovački – Mihalj u 2018. godini, *Annales Instituti Archaeologici*, Vol. XV, 153–166.
- Tomičić, Ž. 2004, Regensburg – Budim – Ilok. Kasnosrednjovjekovni pećnjaci iz dvora knezova Iločkih dokaz sveza Iloka i Europe / Regensburg – Buda – Ilok. Spätmittelalterliche Ofenkacheln vom Hof der Fürsten von Ilok – Bestätigung der Beziehungen zwischen Ilok und Europa, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu*, Vol. 21, 143–176.
- Varga, S. 2013, Pozadina utemeljenja voćinskog franjevačkog samostana, in: *Voćin: crkva i svetište. Zbornik radova s međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa, Požega – Voćin, 9. i 10. prosinca 2011.*, Žuljević I. (ed.), Biskupski ordinarijat, Požega, 46–82.
- Vařeka, P. 2018, The formation of the three-compartment rural house in medieval Central Europe as a cultural synthesis of different building traditions, in: *Buildings of Medieval Europe. Studies in Social and Landscape Contexts of Medieval Buildings*, Berryman D., Kerr S. (eds.), Oxbow books, Oxford, 139–155.
- Várnai, D. 1970, Várpalota várának építkezési korszakai, in: *Magyar műemlékvédelem 1967–1968*, Hantos L. (ed.), Országos Műemléki Felügyelőség Kiadványai 5, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 147–153.
- Virágos, G. 2006, *The Social Archaeology of Residential Sites: Hungarian Noble Residences and Their Social Context from the Thirteenth Through to the Sixteenth Century: an Outline for Methodology*, British Archaeological Report International Series 1583, Archaeolingua Central European Series 3, BAR Publishing, Oxford.
- Vučetić, R. 2006, Prilog razvoju i tipologiji kurija u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj, in: *Zbornik radova. Međunarodni znanstveno-stručni skup Dvorci i ljetnikovci – Kulturno naslijeđe kao pokretač gospodarskog razvoja, Varaždin, 2006 / Conference proceedings. International conference Manors and Villas – Cultural Heritage as a Generator of Economic Development, Varaždin, 2006*, Obad Šćitaroci M., Božić N. (eds.), Arhitektonski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 415–425.
- Vučetić, R. 2009, Trgovište Prelog – obilježja povijesnog razvoja, *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti*, Vol. 33, 179–190.
- Zec, D. 2007, Plemićka kurija kraj Ružice grada, *Obavijesti – Hrvatsko arheološko društvo*, Vol. XXXIX(1), 118–127.
- Žmegač, A. 2008, Feudalna profana arhitektura – vlastelinski gradovi (burgovi), dvorci, kurije, in: *Krapinsko-zagorska županija. Sakralna arhitektura s inventarom, feudalna arhitektura, spomen-obilježja*, Reberski I. (ed.), Umjetnička topografija Hrvatske 4, Institut za povijest umjetnosti, Zagreb, 81–86.


T. 1



T. 1 Crteži kuhinjske keramike iz istraživanja kurije kraj Orahovice 2017. i 2019. godine (crtež: J. Maslač)

Pl. 1 Drawings of kitchenware excavated in the manor house near Orahovica in 2017 and 2019 (drawing by: J. Maslač)


T.2



T.2 Crteži kuhinjske keramike iz istraživanja kurije kraj Orahovice 2017. i 2019. godine (crtež: J. Maslač)

Pl.2 Drawings of kitchenware excavated in the manor house near Orahovica in 2017 and 2019 (drawing by: J. Maslač)

T. 3



T. 3 Crteži kuhinjske i stolne keramike iz istraživanja kurije kraj Orahovice 2017. i 2019. godine (crtež: J. Maslač)

Pl. 3 Drawings of kitchenware and tableware excavated in the manor house near Orahovica in 2017 and 2019 (drawing by: J. Maslač)

