

**Perspectives on Balkan
Archaeology
(*PeBA*)**

–

**The Early Iron Age:
Methods and Approaches**

April 8th/9th, 2016

National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
Sarajevo

Organised by
Mario Gavranović, Daniela Heilmann,
Aleksandar Jašarević and Marek Verčík

Contacts:

Mario Gavranović, Institute for Oriental and European
Archaeology, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna
Mario.Gavranovic@oeaw.ac.at

Daniela Heilmann, Graduate School Distant Worlds,
Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich
daniela.heilmann@lmu.de

Aleksandar Jašarević, Regional Museum in Dobož
aleksandar_jas@yahoo.com

Marek Verčík, German Archaeological Institute, Istanbul;
Graduate School Distant Worlds, Ludwig Maximilian
University, Munich
mvercik@yahoo.co.uk

Drage kolege, dragi gosti i učesnici

Organizirane aktivnosti na zaštiti kulturnog naslijeđa Bosne i Hercegovine započete u drugoj polovini 19. st. nakon svojih pionirskih početaka relativno brzo su, kroz Muzejsko društvo, a potom i kroz djelatnost 1888. g. osnovanog Zemaljskog muzeja, poprimile složene i mnogostruke oblike. Prvobitne aktivnosti na prikupljanju, sistematizaciji i obradi arheološkog materijala odvijale su se u okviru tadašnjeg Arheološko – umjetničko – historijskog odjeljenja čiji je fundus popunjavao iskopavanjima ubrzo znamenitih prahistorijskih naseobinskih kompleksa kao što su Glasinac, Debelo brdo – Zlatište – Soukbunar, Donja dolina i dr. Poseban zamah, kao i posebno mjesto na arheološkoj karti Evrope Zemaljski muzej, a s njime i Bosna i Hercegovina, je obezbijedio istraživanjem Butmira, eponimnog naselja neolitske Butmirske kulture, istraživanjem koje je svoju naučnu valorizaciju dobilo na međunarodnom skupu arheologa i antropologa održanom u Sarajevu od 15. do 21. 08. 1894. godine. Iz današnje perspektive preopterećene mogućnostima koje je pružio i nastavlja pružati ubrzan tehnički i spoznajni napredak, fasciniraju rezultati koje su prve generacije stručnjaka, ne isključivo arheologa, postigle u razmjerno kratkom periodu. Neophodno je naglasiti da se od samog početka rada Muzeja, kao i rada na polju arheologije u Bosni i Hercegovini uopšte, jasno prepoznaje napor da se iskopavanjima arheoloških lokaliteta pristupa sistematično, uz uvažavanje tada primjenjivanih metodoloških i naučnih principa, odnosno da naglasak nije stavljan na puko popunjavanje vitrina i depoa „starim i zanimljivim“ predmetima. U vremenima koja su uslijedila, dva svjetska rata kasnije, uz povremene duže ili kraće periode kvantitativnog i kvalitativnog slabljenja svojih aktivnosti, pravdane objektivnim ali i subjektivnim razlozima, Zemaljski muzej BiH je uspijevaao da kao glavni prioritet zadrži naučni pristup u poslovima koje je obavljao. Takav pristup, uz

nezanemarivanje muzeološkog i pedagoškog segmenta posla, a uz dobru koordinaciju sa djelovanjem Centra za balkanološka istraživanja, prvobitno osnovanog unutar samog Zemaljskog muzeja, učinio je da se Sarajevo nametne kao jedan vodećih arheoloških centara na području bivše Jugoslavije.

Taj relativno kontinuiran razvoj jedne institucije, praćen paralelnim razvojem arheološke nauke, naglo je i surovo prekinut ratom 1992. – 1995. g. u kojem se Zemaljski muzej BiH našao, unutar opsjednutog Sarajeva, na prvoj borbenoj liniji te je pretrpio ogromna fizička oštećenja, veliku devastaciju u materijalnom ali i u kadrovskom smislu. Od potonjeg problema, ojačanog neriješenim pravnim statusom, Zemaljski muzej BiH se još nije oporavio. U nastojanjima da ponovo obnovi i u funkciju uvede sve svoje kapacitete, da iskoristi neosporan potencijal, te da se u isto vrijeme prilagodi djelovanju u novom društvenom, tzv. tranzicijskom kontekstu, od velike su važnosti napor koji se ulažu u organizaciju skupova kao što je *“Željezna doba na Balkanu-retrospektiva i perspektiva”* Zadovoljstvo nam je da Zemaljski muzej BiH, nakon preduge, višedecenijske pauze ponovo bude dom i domaćin uvaženim stručnjacima iz naučne oblasti koja je oduvijek bila najbolja slika i ogledalo njegovog rada. Svim učesnicima želimo toplu dobrodošlicu u Zemaljski muzej i zahvaljujemo na podršci koju su nam ukazali svojim prisustvom i učestvovanjem.

Dr. Mirsad Sijarić

Director of the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina

April 2016, Sarajevo

Table of Contents

Alphabetical Index	6
Session Group I	7
The Western Balkans: Research Perspectives	8
Chronology Systems	16
Session Group II	23
Approaching Identities	24
Supra-Regional Approaches:	
Communications and Cultural Dynamics	30
The Southern Balkans: Research Perspectives	34
Notes	41

Alphabetical Index

Ardjanliev, Pero	36
Božič, Dragan	18
Dimitrijević, Milijan	28
Filipović, Vojislav	30
Forić, Melisa	8
Gavranović, Mario	10
Govedarica, Blagoje	7
Heilmann, Daniela	37
Jašarević, Aleksandar	8
Kaljanac, Adnan	24
Kapuran, Aleksandar	21
Metzner-Nebelsick, Carola	23
Ložnjak Dizdar, Daria	16
Pabst, Sabine	26
Papazovska, Aleksandra	34
Potrebica, Hrvoje	32
Pravidur, Andrijana	12
Sejfuli, Ajla	10
Teßmann, Barbara	14
Verčík, Marek	39

Session Group I

Friday, April 8th

08:40 – 12:10

Chair:

Prof. Dr. Blagoje Govedarica

*Department of Eurasian Archaeology,
German Archaeological Institute, Berlin*

The Western Balkans: Research Perspectives

08:40 – 09:00

Changing Perspectives: a New Look at the Early Iron Age in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Melisa Forić MA – Aleksandar Jašarević MA

*Centre for Balkan Studies, Academy of Sciences of
Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo – Regional
Museum, Doboј*

The cultural diversity and wealth of Early Iron Age sites in Bosnia and Herzegovina are of exceptional importance in spite of more recent publicity related to the post-war period. In the past 20 years, the systematic study of and retrospective on Early Iron Age material from previous excavations provide some new and interesting ideas, but there have also been some new discoveries. In this study review, we will try provide a synthesis of the research relating to Iron Age archaeology in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The biggest outbreak was made in area of Middle Iron Age, with the discovery of military graves in Vranjevo selo near Neum and with the publication of grave finds from Ritešić in northern Bosnia. The publication of Illyrian helmets from the sites of Ošanići and Kamenjača gives some new insights into the cultural and historical aspects of these finds. Also, finds from graves can shed

more light on the rise of the new elite in highly socially ranked communities from the second half of the 5th century BC onwards. Elements relating to attire, jewellery and military equipment demonstrate more complex cultural dynamics and relationships within Iron Age society. The broader area along the course of the Rivers Bosnia, Sava, Vrbas, Sana, Neretva, etc. played an important role in the prehistoric communication network. In some ways, the rivers acted as a link between the Iron Age cultures of the Balkans. Research on Iron Age hill forts, especially in Glasinac and northern Bosnia, suggests that these areas played a complex role in the prehistoric communication network. New projects aim to investigate the nature and extent of prehistoric settlements and any evidence of landscape change, but we encounter a number of problems: from the absence of reliable absolute dates related to stratigraphic contexts to a lack of specialised studies in archaeobotany, archaeozoology and similar fields.

09:00 – 09:20

The Early Iron Age in Central Bosnia – Overview and Research Perspectives

Dr. Mario Gavranović – Ajla Sejfuli MA

*Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology,
Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna – Regional
Museum, Travnik*

This paper will discuss the current state of research and general interpretation models for the Early Iron Age period in the mountainous area of central Bosnia. The landscape of this region is characterised by relatively small river valleys and the basins of the Vrbas, Lašva and upper Bosna Rivers, each of them representing separate micro-regions. Most of the data regarding the period between the 8th and 5th centuries BC are generated from the excavation of the hilltop settlement of Pod in the upper Vrbas Valley. Preliminary reports point to a well-organized settlement structure with equally well-organised, large and rectangular houses. The hitherto presented finds from Pod reveal an extended exchange network between the settlement community and neighbouring areas, but also with the distant regions of Italy and Greece. However, only some of the results of the long-term investigations on this site have been published, and other settlements sites have only been very poorly investigated. To a great extent, the mortuary practices of the Early Iron Age communities in central Bosnia are unknown as, until now, no intact grave finds

had been documented. Some of the destroyed graves, such as those at Stara Bila or Gračanica, near Visoko, indicate a variety of burial customs (tumuli, flat graves, inhumations, cremations). Considering the insufficient state of research and the limited number of publications, it is difficult to outline any kind of general picture, as has been undertaken in previous overview studies.

09:20 – 09:40

Zagrađe Type Fibulae – a Question of Origin?

Andrijana Pravidur PhD

*National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
Sarajevo*

The local type of fibula known from a grave inventory in the north-western Glasinac area was first defined as the Zagrađe type by Petar Popović from Belgrade in 1996. The characteristic feature of this bronze fibula type of Early La Tène construction is a knee-shaped (triangular) bow with a cross-hatched transversal band at the top and a reverted foot ending in a stylised animal head with gaping jaws, ornamented with a band of the same form. The spring has six coils and an external cord. This type of fibula was found in the Glasinac area at the sites of Zagrađe (grave 2 from tumulus 1) and Gosinja planina (tumulus 21).

The Zagrađe type fibulae are also known outside the Glasinac area in Herzegovina, from Gorica, near Grude, and from Varvara. Revision of the material in the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina revealed five new Zagrađe type fibulae from Mala Gradina in Varvara, near Prozor. One find from the central Bosnian site of Pod near Bugojno should also be added to the number of known fibulae, as well as seven fibulae, which were probably found in the vicinity of Fojnica in the same region (the exact site is unknown).

Fibulae with Zagrađe type elements have been registered in the Glasinac area (Rusanovići and Podilijak), in central Bosnia (at Debelo Brdo, near Sarajevo) and in the north-western Bosnian sites such as Sanski Most (grave 109) and Donja Dolina (M. Petrović jr.'s ridge, grave 43).

Based on the data provided, numerous finds of these fibulae in northern Herzegovina (Mala Gradina in Varvara) and central Bosnia (Pod, near Bugojno and Fojnica) raise the question of whether the Zagrađe type of fibulae could perhaps have originated in northern Herzegovina or central Bosnia.

09:40 – 10:00

Studies on Heavy Ribbed, Two-Part Bow Fibulae from the Necropolis of Jezerine

Barbara Teßmann M.A.

Berlin

Bow fibulae with a twisted or narrow-ribbed bow in the groups II and IV (after F. Lo Schiavo (Lo Schiavo 1970, 429–430) were predominantly unearth in the japodic area. The fibulae of group II are represented by a few exemplars from the Lika-Highland; fibulae of group IV were found in the cemeteries of the Una Valley. Lo Schiavo distinguished two types of fibula in the Una Valley: Golubić and Jezerine type. This report focuses on the fibulae of group IV.

This fibula type comprises two-piece fibulae with a heavy ribbed bow and with a length of between 4.5 and 6.5 cm. Some specimens are slightly smaller and may have belonged to the costumes of children. The needle is not preserved on any fibula from the burial sites of Jezerine. These fibulae were worn by both right- and left-handed users, but the number of fibulae by right-handers clearly predominates. In many examples, the needle holder is decorated with incised patterns; a few specimens in contrast present vertical lines. These may represent fingers, belonging to the hand that holds the needle.

Most fibulae were found on their own. Associated finds with secure dates are missing, which makes chronological

classification difficult. The absence of further grave goods is also the reason gender allocation is limited.

F. Lo Schiavo

Il gruppo liburnico-japodico per una definizione nell'ambito della protostoria balcanica (Rom 1970).

Chronology Systems

10:50 – 11:10

Tradition and Innovation at the Beginning of the Early Iron Age in the Southern Carpathian Basin

Dr. Daria Ložnjak Dizdar

Institute of Archaeology, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb

The aim of this presentation is to analyse different chronological systems which were used on regional/local levels in the southern Carpathian Basin at the end of the Late Bronze and the beginning of Early Iron Age. The focus will be on the area of the southern Carpathian Basin (northern Croatia, south-eastern Slovenia and the Serbian Danube Region) as a link in the chain that connected Balkan Early Iron Age communities with Central European systems. The related literature and new preliminary results of several excavated cemeteries in northern Croatia demonstrate the need for well-evidenced regional chronological studies and their placement within supra-regional studies. They can be connected on different levels and by different criteria, depending on the case studies. By studying the mortuary practices of communities in different areas of the southern Carpathian Basin at the end of the Late Bronze Age and the beginning of the Early Iron Age,

our results warn us of the traps involved in using the existing cultural models and point to the necessity for their critical re-evaluation within supra-regional studies. This paper will attempt to compare different existing chronology systems in the transitional period from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age (Marić 1964. – Vinski-Gasparini 1973; 1983; 1987. – Gabrovec 1973. – Garašanin 1973. – Medović 1978; 1994. – Čović 1987. – Vasić 1987. – Teržan 1990. – Metzner-Nebelsick 1996; 2002. – Pare 1998. – Gavranović 2011. – Teržan – Črešnar 2014). Several issues are obvious in the chronological systems used in the wider Balkan area: different criteria, methodologies were used, and the state of research also differed. Thus, the advantages and disadvantages of the current state of research must be acknowledged and used to the advantage of present and future research.

11:10 – 11:30

The Relative Chronology of the Dolenjska Hallstatt Group – the History of Research and its Importance for the Chronologies of the Neighbouring Areas

Dr. Dragan Božič

Institute of Archaeology, Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Ljubljana

The first modern relative chronology of the Dolenjska group of the Hallstatt culture was created by Stane Gabrovec in 1963. He divided the Early Iron Age in Dolenjska into the following phases: Podzemelj 1 and 2, Stična 1 and 2, the phase of Scythian influences, and the Negova Helmet phase.

In 1971, he and Otto-Herman Frey made some changes to this scheme. They gave a new name to the phase of Scythian influences (Certosa Fibulae phase) and inserted a new phase between this phase and the Stična 2 phase: the Double-crested Helmets phase. Biba Teržan, a student of Gabrovec, renamed in her study on the Certosa type fibulae, which was published in 1976, the Double-crested Helmets phase as the Serpentine Fibulae phase and subdivided the last two phases, the Certosa and Negova phases, into an earlier and a later part.

Such a division was also used by Gabrovec in his quite basic study on the Dolenjska group, which was published

in the fifth volume of *Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja* (Sarajevo 1987). Here, Gabrovec exhaustively and systematically presented the typical types of finds and graves of every single phase.

The chapter on chronology in the book of Janez Dular (*Hallstatt cemeteries of Dolenjska*, Ljubljana 2003) is not original, but rather a summary of Gabrovec's chapter on the Dolenjska group's chronology from 1987. He added to the text many pictures of typical graves, several of which were published after 1987. His dating of the small finds, especially of the jewellery and of the pottery, is sometimes incorrect.

In 2010, a monograph with studies on the Early Iron Age barrows from Stična (Stična II/2) was published. The main chapters were written by Gabrovec (Barrows of Stična) and by Teržan (Stična sketches). Gabrovec presented a chronological division of barrow 48, which differs greatly from his 1987 chronology. It should also be pointed out that his four chronological phases are mostly incorrect. Teržan dated some male graves from barrow 48 on the chronological table on p. 293, but most of these are wrong. The central grave 19–22, ascribed to the Podzemelj phase, does not exist; rather, the finds relate to Stična 2 and the Certosa phases. The important grave 33 (a warrior's grave in a square, stone grave chamber) was dated by Teržan approximately 150 years too early.

Finally, in 2014 Teržan decided to give up Gabrovec's designations of the early phases (Podzemelj 1 and 2, and Stična 1) and introduced, with no good reason, three new

phases: an iron phase, a phase of the earliest horse graves and a Boat Fibulae phase.

Based only on the reliable grave groups (mostly from Stična and Novo mesto), Gabrovec's still-basic chronology from 1987 can easily be improved. New research, conducted by the authors in the past five years, has unearthed many new details (although the general picture remained unchanged), new views on the development of the pottery and of some types of weapons and of the jewellery, as well as new dates for some important graves.

The improved Gabrovec chronology of the Dolenjska group with its certain nine phases is very important for all neighbouring cultures, where such a clear division is not feasible.

11:30 – 11:50

Chronological Problems in the Continuity of Iron Age Cultural Groups in North-Eastern Serbia

Aleksandar Kapuran PhD

Institute of Archaeology, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Belgrade

This paper aims to reveal specific inconsistencies in chronological systems used for decades in Iron Age studies of north-eastern Serbia. Certain divergences from chronological systems have been observed during the revision of the archaeological finds coming from previous excavations in eastern Serbia, based on sites from the Panonian plain and Pomoravlje, as well as on some recently discovered sites. It has been noted that there is no clear chronological boundary between the finds of various cultural groups at several Iron Age sites along the Danube river valley in Serbia, as is the case in adjacent areas of the Balkans, where they are found clearly stratigraphically separated.

D. Jacanović was the first to discuss this problem during the excavations of Early Iron Age sites along the right bank of the Danube in the vicinity of Požarevac, where he found archaeological material from Žuto Brdo and Gava cultures in the same context, which was also evident at several necropolises in the Iron Gates area. The complete absence of the Kalakača group is apparent in the chronology of the

Early Iron Age in this area, except in the case of the necropolis Vajuga-Pesak, where a small number of finds from this cultural group were found, together with finds that are typical for Basarabi culture.

The phenomenon of mixed stylistic properties observed in Early and Late Iron Age material culture is also evident in enclosed structures of the Late Iron Age, as evidenced by the recently discovered grave from Mokranje, near Negotin. This child burial, dated to the 2nd century BC, contained typical Ferigile pottery vessels together with characteristic La Tène pottery forms, which points to a discontinuity of several centuries.

Session Group II

Friday, April 8th

14:00 – 18:00

Chair:

Prof. Dr. Carola Metzner-Nebelsick

*Faculty of Cultural Studies and
Archaeology, Ludwig Maximilian
University, Munich*

Approaching Identities

14:00 – 14:20

Problem definiranja metodoloških parametara za identificiranje identiteta zajednica željeznog doba na zapadnom Balkanu

Dr. Adnan Kaljanac

Department of Archaeology, University of Sarajevo

U okvirima dosadašnje bosanskohercegovačke arheološke paradigme je odnos prema prahistorijskom identitetu bio dominantno fokusiran na identificiranje jasnih arheoloških krugova kao ekvivalenta poznatim historijskim zajednicama, tačnije rečeno, identificiranju manjih dijelova znatno većeg organizma kojeg su arheologija i historiografija XX stoljeća definirali širokim pojmom Iliri. Međutim, iako se takvo identificiranje prahistorijskih zajednica zapadnog Balkana generalno uzimalo kao *de facto* prirodno stanje nekadašnjeg identiteta, metodološka argumentacija ove teze nikada nije uspostavljena. Štoviše, cjelokupan koncept je baziran na interpretiranju historijskih izvora, što je postalo tradicionalnim obilježjem bosanskohercegovačke arheologije. Neutemeljenost ovog pristupa, kao i simplificiranje problema definiranja identiteta u prahistorijskom periodu, su određeni znanstvenici uvidjeli već polovinom XX stoljeća te je tako

M. Suić već 1955. godine prostor Ilira sveo na dijelove oko Epidamnosa i rijeke Palamnos. Slično njemu, Z. Marić je 1957. godine razmatrao mogućnosti arheološkog identificiranja znatno manjih, pojedinačnih identiteta unutar šarolikog skupa zajednica te je naglasio značaj interpretacije keramičkog materijala koji se danas može promatrati kao svakodnevno sredstvo unutarnjeg cirkuliranja informacija u jednoj zajednici. Poput Suića i Marića, A. Benac je u ovom problemu otišao korak dalje te je davne 1973. godine naglasio činjenicu da je jedini način istinskog razumijevanja i identificiranja prahistorijskog identiteta postavljanje jasnih kriterija identificiranja pri čemu je arheološke nalaze neophodno postaviti na prvo mjesto i iznad pisanih podataka. Promatrano iz današnje perspektive evidentno je da su tadašnji bosanskohercegovački arheolozi, kao i svjetski, uvidjeli slabost preslikavanja pisanog podatka na stvarni identitet ljudskih zajednica te su inicirali preusmjeravanje glavnog fokusa pri istraživanju prahistorijskog identiteta na ostatke materijalne kulture. Iako ovaj proces uslijed prekida u djelovanju bosanskohercegovačke arheologije na polju etnogenetskih istraživanja nikada nije završen, kombinacijom i primjenom današnjih metoda razvijenih u djelima S. Jones, K. Kristiansena i drugih, pitanje arheološkog identificiranja je moguće postaviti u okvire novih parametara istraživanja prostorne arheologije, naselja, materijalnih ostataka svakodnevnog života te socijalne stratifikacije povezane sa kneževskim ukopima.

14:20 – 14:40

Early Iron Age Female Costumes with Spectacle Fibulae and Double Disc Fibulae in the Western Balkans – Investigations of Cultural, Social and Ethnic Continuity

Dr. Sabine Pabst

Seminar for Prehistory, Philipp University of Marburg

The study of prehistoric costume elements and costumes is closely connected with cultural-historical, social and also ethnic issues. The ethnic interpretation of archaeological cultural groups has been a main topic of Iron Age research of the Balkan Peninsula for a long time. Generally, a group-specific character is attributed to costumes by recent ethnographic and archaeological research. Because of their individuality, costumes serve as a means of self-assignment to special social, regional or even ethnic groups. However, numerous ethnographic studies have demonstrated that we must assume dynamic rather than static structures. Clothing as a means of individual expression is related to personal and social identity. Therefore, processes of change in dress code are generally associated with social changes. In the talk, there will be a discussion on the problems of cultural, social and ethnic continuity in the Iron Age western Balkans based on female costumes, which are characterised by specific, visually striking dress fasteners (the so-called ‘spectacle

fibulae') and the phenotypically related double disc fibulae. These results come from a former dissertation project conducted by the speaker and subsequent research on intercultural relationships in the Early Iron Age Balkans. Women of various Balkan cultural groups wore these brooches over a very long period of time. In several areas, this fibula shape was used from 11th/10th century BC until the 3rd/2nd century BC; that is, from the beginning of the Early Iron Age until the onset of literary tradition. The study includes the interpretation of different distribution maps of fibula types, whose classification is especially determined by workshop-specific technological details. Furthermore, the structure of costume sets from several regions and periods will be examined for possible continuity or discontinuity. Proposals for social and ethnic interpretations of the archaeological picture conclude the paper.

14.40 – 15.00

Socioekonomski odnosi i identiteti u gvozdenom dobu jugoistočnog jadrana – nove interpretativne perspektive

Milijan Dimitrijević MA

Department of Archaeology, University of Belgrade

Uzimajući u obzir kritičke analize dominantnog tumačenja socio – ekonomskih odnosa u širem kontekstu kasne evropske praistorije pa i u gvozdenom dobu centralnog i zapadnog Balkana koje je zasnovano na kulturno – istorijskoj epistemologiji, ukazuje se potreba za novim interpretativnim perspektivama ove problematike. Prihvaćeno tumačenje kasne praistorije koje počiva na konceptu arheološke kulture a odlikuje ga etnički determinizam, formalističko shvatanje ekonomskih odnosa, difuzionizam i migracionizam kao objašnjenja kulturnih promena, pokazuje se kao moderan konstrukt i projekcija savremenih fenomena na daleku prošlost.

Nove interpretativne perspektive u tumačenju socio – ekonomskih odnosa i kolektivnih identiteta u kasnoj praistoriji mogu proizaći iz drugačijeg antropološkog pristupa problematici koji počiva na *supstantivističkoj* antropologiji Karla Polanjija i *teoriji prakse* Pjera Burdijea.

Socio – ekonomski odnosi u gvozdenom dobu, jasno iskazani kroz arheološke nalaze, mogu se razumeti kao

ključna okosnica pojedinačnog i kolektivnog prepoznavanja u prošlosti. Učešće društvenih aktera (pojedinaca i grupa) u različitim socio – ekonomskim „mrežama“ razmene tokom gvozdenog doba, sprovedenim kroz kontinuirane prakse (razmena i trgovina), bilo je jedno od polazišta poistovećivanja ili razlikovanja od drugog. S druge strane, etnički identitet koji je teže prepoznatljiv prema arheološkim tragovima, pokazuje se kao drugačije društveno polje od identiteta reprodukovanom prema socio – ekonomskim relacijama i manje izražena kategorija u praistoriji u odnosu na njeno moderno vrednovanje.

Socio – ekonomski odnosi u mlađem gvozdenom dobu jugoistočnog Jadrana i bliskog zaleđa, čija je glavna manifestacija pojava utvrđenih “helenizovanih” naselja, predstavljaju u tom smislu pogodno istraživačko polje. Naročito ilustrativan primer predstavlja studija slučaja naselja u Ošanićima.

Prema arheološkim nalazima, predstave o kolektivnim identitetima pojedinaca i grupa u prošlosti, socijalno i statusno prepoznavanje i razlikovanje, kao i prakse kojima su stvarani i reprodukovani socio – ekonomski odnosi, pokazuju se kao povezani i povratni fenomeni koji su proizašli jedan iz drugog.

Istraživanjem se, iz ugla arheologije, otvara mogućnost drugačijeg razumevanja podataka iz istorijskih izvora glede balkanske protoistorije.

Supra-Regional Approaches: Communications and Cultural Dynamics

15.00 – 15.20

Some Observations about Communications and Contacts between the Central Balkan Region and surrounding areas, based on Weapon Distribution (7th–5th century BC)

Dr. Vojislav Filipović

*Institute of Archaeology, Serbian Academy of
Sciences and Arts, Belgrade*

Today, we can assume, with a higher degree of probability, a regional distribution of the Paleo-Balkan tribes during the period between the 7th and the 5th centuries BC, considering written sources and the material and spiritual cultures. Besides some specific objects, which could be connected with some tribes, such as Glasinac single-looped fibulae, Mramorac-type specimens, amber, Greek luxury metal vessels or openwork belts, the weapons and defensive equipment, which were registered in these areas, point toward specific distribution. If we observe the distribution of the defensive equipment, we can note a complete gap between the Velika Morava and Isker Rivers. On the other hand, bronze helmets, greaves and shields can be found from the Vardar river valley to the Albanian coast, and towards the Glasinac Mountains in the

nort-west. Swords have a similar distribution as defensive equipment. Thus, if we observe some older specimens, such as the so-called 'Glasinac swords and greaves with rings ornamented with an embossing technique', we can note that their usage is limited to the territories of the eastern West Balkan and western Central Balkan regions, or, roughly, to the territory of the Glasinac-Mati cultural complex. Similar distribution is repeated during later periods, if we observe bronze helmets and *xiphoi* swords, which obviously point to southern influences. On the other hand, we keep seeing so-called 'Scythian arrows', which point to northern and eastern influences, throughout the whole area: in the western parts, these are usually in the graves, while in the eastern regions these arrows are common around strongholds. Probably as early as the Neolithic period, the main Balkan communication routes were, certainly, the Morava–Vardar axis as well as so-called *Via Militaris*, the road from the Sava and Danube Rivers that passes through the Morava and Nišava Valleys and continues on towards Asia Minor. These communication routes were often used during the previous periods, i.e. the Late Bronze Age and Transitional periods, which can be concluded based on the distribution of materials of Aegean or Central European origin, as well as amber. On the other hand, during the period between the 7th and the 5th centuries BC, these routes declined slowly in popularity, and the main north–south communication route became the Drim, Ibar, Western Morava and Drina Rivers.

15.20 – 15.40

Cultural Dynamics between Southern Pannonia and the Northern Balkans in the Early Iron Age

Prof. Dr. Hrvoje Potrebica

Department of Archaeology, University of Zagreb

Recent research undertaken on the Požega Valley indicates that interrelations and communication between the eastern Alps, southern Pannonia and the Danubian area were much more intensive and dynamic than previously thought. The broad area along the River Sava played an important role in this multilevel communication. It acted as a link between the east and west, but it was also a contact zone between Pannonia and the Alpine area, as well as between the Hallstatt cultural circle and the Iron Age cultures of the Balkans. However, this area was not just a transit zone. The centres located along the route, which mostly followed the Sava Valley, were involved in a process of cultural transfer. The Požega Valley lies in the central part of a transversal route from Pannonia to northern Bosnia, and it probably played a very important role in the transfer and transformation of cultural impulses and elements of the material culture between these two areas. The character and intensity of connections, illustrated by the material culture of centres such as Sanski Most, Donja Dolina and Kaptol, are of crucial importance for understanding the communication dynamics on a much wider scale, in a period from roughly Ha C2 and Ha D1 to as late as Lt B1.

This was also the period of time when ideas and material culture from the Balkans reach the Sava Valley and joined the intensive east–west communication. Outside Donja Dolina, the cultural influence from the Balkans is most visible in the Požega Valley, which is also the northernmost point reached by those influences. The contact between these two centres also raises some chronological issues, the most important of which are connected with the end of the Kaptol cultural group and the Hallstatt/La Tène transition in general in this area.

The Southern-Balkans: Research Perspectives

16.20 – 16.40

The Appearance of the Early Iron Age in the Republic of Macedonia – the Phenomenon of Tumular Burials

Aleksandra Papazovska PhD

Archaeological Museum of Macedonia, Skopje

The Early Iron Age in R. Macedonia (10th to the beginning of the 8th century BC) was a period of unclear and undefined cultural values for these communities which were influenced by the new waves of the Transitional period. Yet, besides these influences, local communities also developed their own specific and characteristic appearances in the material culture. There is the obvious influence of the local Bronze Age culture, mixed with the northern elements of Hallstatt cultures from the western Balkan regions. Some of these elements existed for only a short time during the Transitional period and disappeared leaving no trace of their further development. The elements that were accepted were adapted to the local tastes (and needs) of the Iron Age communities, thus becoming incorporated into and recognisable parts of the local Iron Age culture. All of these elements present specific manifestations of the Early Iron Age culture in R.

Macedonia, bringing it closer to the northern and north-western Iron Age cultures in the Balkan Peninsula. One of the most specific cultural phenomena of the Early Iron Age is the burial under tumuli. This was a new burial practice derived from the new way of life and new social relations in society. In this way, these burials, known as clan tumuli, played a major role in the appearance and the development of the Early Iron Age in Macedonia.

16.40 – 17.00

Burial Rites of the Archaic Period in the Territory of the Central Balkans: Migration or Abandonment of Traditions?

Pero Ardjanliev MA

Archaeological Museum of Macedonia, Skopje

Almost a century after the spectacular discovery of a few wealthy graves near the village of Trebeništa, in the Ohrid municipality, the public and scientific interest in the ‘mystery’ of these finds has not decreased. On the contrary, the scientific debate on the numerous questions that have remained open since then were raised again with the discovery of new graves at cemeteries with identical grave goods and chronological frames (second half of the 6th to beginning of 5th century BC), located in the wider area of the Central Balkans (Petilep-Beranci, Sindos, Chalkidiki, Ohrid, Archontiko). Therefore, I present here my opinion on certain archaeological contexts related to these burials, as a contribution to the debate and an attempt to provide an answer to some of the questions raised. This research concern another similarity between the aforementioned cemeteries – the abandonment of the Iron Age cemeteries and traditions, and the appearance of new cemeteries in their vicinity, where the wealthy graves of the Archaic period now occupy a central position, together with other novelties that accompany this event.

17.00 – 17.20

The Vardar and Bregalnica Valley during the Early Iron Age – Contact Zones between the Central Balkans and Thermaic Gulf

Daniela Heilmann M.A.

Graduate School Distant Worlds, Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich

A study of burial customs in the Balkan Peninsula reveals a number of regional and localised burial rituals. The rituals performed are understood as part of a symbolic communication, constantly shaping and re-shaping identities. On the basis of comparable burial-ritual practices, community identities are determined and used as a basis for further considerations. The aim of the paper will be to set burial groups in a macro-regional context in order to understand changes as well as supra-regional relationships within the local communities.

As a case study, several Macedonian cemeteries along the Vardar and Bregalnica Valley are analysed; these are comparable on the basis of the construction of the graves, the burial rites and the offering of certain local ceramics, as well as male and female costumes. Certain differentiations are possible with regard to female customs. Alongside the ‘traditional’ and ‘local’ forms, there are widespread objects, which are useful for analysing the supra-regional contacts of certain burial groups.

By the chronological and chorological analysis of objects diffused supra-regionally, various relationships between the burial groups can be noted. At the beginning of the developed Iron Age – the 8th and 7th centuries BC – certain groups seem to be closely connected with the Central Balkan area whereas other groups are incorporated into a communication sphere that is oriented further south. These different developments are especially visible in the differentiated use of one- or two-looped bow fibulae alongside the use, or lack, of Macedonian bronzes within the burial groups.

At the latest, in the second half of the 6th century, discontinuities can be noted at different levels within groups, especially along the Vardar Valley. Cemeteries such as Marvinci-Lisičin Dol or Dedeli-Meleznik are not in use anymore. Fibulae types which are further developed in other regions at the same time are difficult to discern in the Vardar Valley, as are certain forms of Macedonian bronzes. The material culture from the end of the 6th to the beginning of the 5th century BC reveals similarities with finds from Sindos and the Ohrid region.

The interrupted relationships with the Central Balkan region as well as the appearance of new forms may indicate transformed structures of power within the Macedonian regions, which is further emphasised by the appearance of ostentatious graves such as those at Trebenište, Archontiko or Sindos.

17.20 – 17.40

A View from the South: Hellenization, Centre-Periphery or Did Something Change in the Nature of the Contacts between Greece and Macedonia in the Archaic Period?

Dr. Marek Verčík

*German Archaeological Institute, Istanbul;
Graduate School Distant Worlds, Ludwig
Maximilian University, Munich*

Until quite recently, Macedonia was perceived as differing in terms of cultural features from the southern Aegean in pre-Classical periods. This polarised view was frequently explained by the region's proximity to the Balkans and was apparently supported by near-contemporary writers, such as Herodotus or Thucydides. However, recent research has demonstrated that the supposed polarity owes more to a lack of investigation than to objective differences. Thus, it is no longer feasible to distinguish societies of the northern Aegean as having a wholly different way of life which was gradually modified as a result of contact with cities further south – something that Hellenization or, more recently, World System approaches have highlighted. Rather, it is appropriate to question the very nature of these, supposedly one-way, contacts according to the new material evidence. In this paper, I will attempt – using the example of the single-edge sword (μάχαιρα or κοπίς) – to re-examine the

defining feature of the assumed Hellenization: hoplite armour, which was an essential component of Greek identity. By analysing the origin and distribution of this characteristic northern or 'barbarian' weapon, the diversity within its development and the impact of conflicts, peaceful contacts or exchange with Macedonia as well as the Balkans will be presented. This ultimately makes it possible to re-evaluate the 'classical' view that the area of the northern Aegean in the archaic period as a buffer-region and, rather, to consider it as a zone of intense contact lacking a dominant partner.

Notes

