

Kritike i prikazi / Besprechungen

Svend Hansen, *Bilder vom Menschen der Steinzeit*, Archäologie in Eurasien 20, Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 2007, price 180 KM

It does not happen very often that certain book fascinates you so much that you do not let it out of your hands until you finish reading it. Also, it does not happen very often that certain professional book gives you such pleasure and on the way saves you many months of painstaking work, visiting many museums and studying of hundreds and hundreds of sometimes difficult to obtain objects and books or articles. The book *Bilder vom Menschen der Steinzeit* by Dr Svend Hansen published in a series Archäologie in Eurasien is just that kind of book. The comprehensiveness and studiousness provide additional security to all those who will engage in the future in the analysis of the anthropomorphic figurines knowing that the referent bibliographic entry is already here.

The subtitle of this two volume book, *Untersuchungen zur anthropomorphen Plastik der Jungsteinzeit und Kupferzeit in Suedosteuropa* limits this investigation to the area of the southeast Europe in the Neolithic and the Eneolithic period. However, the author made an effort to begin his presentation with the introductory chapters concerning the anthropomorphic figurines from the Paleolithic period and from the Neolithic period of western Asia, central and western Anatolia and the Neolithic of Greece in order to introduce us to the distinct but with many mutual connections intertwined problems of emergence and flourishing of the figural plastic in the southeast Europe. The fact is that anthropomorphic figurines of the Neolithic and Copper Age in the southeast Europe represent the most comprehensive iconographic corpus in the entire prehistory of Europe but still apart from the most attractive specimens it has been rather neglected until the appearance of the Hansen's book. According to Hansen the number of figurines exceeded by far 30,000! specimens in the few recent decades and more recent archaeological investigations. For that reason also the book we are talking about arrived just at the right time.

In the course of his elaboration S. Hansen makes an effort in order to finally distinguish the facts from speculations, to look impartially to the problem of the anthropomorphic figurines and to avoid the bias resulting from the development of ethnology and history of religion in the 19th century encumbered with apparent and first sight analogies. This is, therefore, one of the very first works in which an effort was made to advance beyond the existing hypotheses about significance and role of the anthropomorphic figurines that we have the opportunity to read so far in the professional but even more in the popular literature.

In brief, on one hand it concerns the interpretation of the anthropomorphic figurines as confirmations of the matriarchy of the 'old Europe' or the images of the 'Great Goddess'. But on the other, the figurines are perceived as basic component of the 'revolution of symbols' taking place in the beginning of the Neolithic period. In both instances the figurines are assigned significant if not even decisive role in the reconstruction of the Neolithic system of beliefs. Also their cult role was prejudged in both instances, so they are mostly classified within some of the variants of the fertility cult. The attitude of Hansen is that things are not that simple and that figurines must first to be systematized, analyzed and on the basis of thus achieved results the hypotheses should be established independently of inherited presumptions. S. Hansen regards the figurines as an authentic artistic reflection of the epoch and thus make possible taking into consideration social questions related to their origin, appearance and evolution. S. Hansen also offers an excellent analysis when social circumstances for emergence and evolution of the figurines are concerned and thus he emphasizes that process of sedentarization in the original areas of the Neolithic civilization coincides with the beginning of production of these artifacts, which from the very beginning are acquitted from some earlier stereotypes and express the symbolic messages and the spirit of the epoch much more freely and using the new material. On the other hand the author is not for a single moment deceived that this is the way to reach definitely crystallized opinions but that it is just the way to reach new and sometimes unexpected possibilities of interpretation but also, what is of exceptional importance for the study of these artifacts, the clearly established limits in interpretation.

S. Hansen based his study and interpretation of the anthropomorphic figurines on the four basic elements in the archaeological analysis that are consequently applied: style, typology, archaeological context of the finds and distribution of these objects in time and space. When discussing the stylistic traits Hansen is concerned with body proportions, modeling of distinct body parts, characteristic manner of decoration and similar aspects. This method of analysis is slightly supplemented method used in the analysis of the objects of arts by the archaeologists as well as by the art historians. When typological analysis of the figurines is concerned Hansen assumes as type the manner of depicting given figurine that is whether it is: seated, standing, reclining, with hands crossed on the bosom or underneath or with outstretched arms. He deliberately does not make more precise distinguishing of types because any more precise distinguishing would have been applicable on distinct regions and subphases and not on the entire region of the Near East and the southeast Europe, so that would undermine the impression of unique origin of this phenomenon. The archaeological context of the most of discovered figurines is a sore point of the Neolithic archaeology because just a small number is correctly published with detailed documentation and precisely denoted provenance.

It is almost impossible to establish the distribution of these objects except in the most roughly manner: that they are most often found in the settlements and that they have not been encountered as grave offerings. Considering the settlements they have been found in houses or outside, as well as in the pits, leveling layers and cultural horizons and it seems that it is the characteristic of

both studied regions. Although his primary interest in this work was not according to stated notions and set goals the function of the anthropomorphic figurines but resolving its importance for the ancient communities, S. Hansen draws the conclusion on the basis of the available data that figurines had been used during the short period of time and for different purposes. We need not necessarily agree with this conclusion considering that there are more explanations for such distribution including leveling of the terrain, secondary use of structures, imprecise field investigations, lack of good quality documentation and the like. The fourth element in the Hansen's archaeological approach is the spatial and chronological distribution of the figural art. He perceives the human visualization and tendency to depict human image as a constant and thinks that in this case the prehistoric archaeology is in a position to contribute to the diachronic study and understanding of this phenomenon thanks to the anthropomorphic figurines. He associates the corpus of figurines with the east Mediterranean cultural circle and states that such artistic creations almost do not appear outside this area.

S. Hansen analyzes the examples of the Paleolithic figurines in a distinct chapter. Considering that figural art appears in the Middle and Late Paleolithic he relates this fact to the occurrence of organized and specialized hunters for the large animals. Such type of hunting assumed specialization and better organization of the societies, which besides objects of art also left large camp sites and more permanent habitations in the region of Kostienki, Dolni Vestonice and Pavlov. Such, more complex social organization was according to Hansen convenient ground for the first anthropomorphic figurines. The interrelation and interdependence between social organization and mass production of figurines could be furthermore observed in the abrupt discontinuance of production of the figural objects of art that was again influenced by the change in subsistence strategy, i.e. by the discontinuation of hunting for the mammoths and other large mammals.

When the areas of western Asia (Levant) are concerned the figural art appears in the Natufian period again as a consequence of enlargement of settlements, population increase, partial sedentarization and specialization. The results of increased number of individuals living within limited area as a consequence of the sedentary process are the social conflicts and hence the need to challenge them by clear delineation of space, group and individual. The figural plastic as it seems from this point of view is an ideal addition in such intentions.

The figural plastic transformation is experiencing the decisive moment during the pre-pottery Neolithic (PPNA) when the 'hunched' figures of the Paleolithic period transformed into standing figures with heads turned upwards (stone figurine from Mureybat, Syria and terracotta from Netiv Hagdud, Israel). In this period was according to S. Hansen definitely established the 'stereotypical style of the Neolithic visualization' that is to determine later evolution of the figural art. In the following PPNB period the new elements appeared that were to be woven into the future evolution of the figurines in the entire area from the Levant to the Balkans. These are the representations of female figure with arms crossed under the breasts. The term 'stereotypical style of the Neolithic visualization' S. Hansen even promotes to the level of those innovations, which like ground stone technology, pottery production or domestication of animals and plants – demarcate two large periods of human past.

The investigation of the Neolithic sites in Anatolia is of great importance for the study of the anthropomorphic figurines from the southeast Europe. Although few recent decades witnessed the investigations at considerable number of sites and publishing of few significant books the investigations in this area did not reach the satisfying level. Nevertheless, it is possible on the basis of the so far investigated sites and considering certain distinctions to confirm an earlier assumption that Anatolia is the bridge between the East and the Balkans. This could be confirmed when the figurines are concerned but also in the ornamental system of pottery decoration (Kuruçay, Hacilar, Hoyuçek). The fact that there are no anthropomorphic figurines in the northwest of Anatolia suggests that routes of spreading of the Neolithic traditions towards the Balkan Peninsula probably bypassed this region in the first moment.

Hansen noticed the heterogeneity of the Greek mainland also in the Early Neolithic period. While the Neolithic with all its characteristics was in full flourish in the Thessalian plain similar situation was encountered somewhat more to the north in the area of the Gulf of Salonika. Large quantity of the anthropomorphic figurines indicates that this form of artistic expression was well-liked. S. Hansen emphasizes that figurines from this period are in all aspects parallel with 'models' in the Near East. However, the situation is rather different to the south of Volos, in Attica and in Peloponnesus. The figural plastic in those regions is by far less numerous. This, however, could be the consequence of unequal level of investigation in these regions. If we accept Hansen's opinion about the decisive impact of social factors, which reflect the intense collective life with the need to demarcate personal and collective then we could come to the conclusion that there were no prominent social tensions in the south of Greece and that could also be the consequence of relatively low population density. In this work is once again emphasized the fact that the Thessalian variant of the Neolithic represents in fact the link with the cultures, which existed in Macedonia, Albania, Struma valley, in the central Balkans or even in Transylvania at the same time or slightly later. The figural art and anthropomorphic figurines in particular experienced great ascent in the region of Thessaly. The figurines are exceptionally well made and appear in great quantity of types, which could be followed without exception to the regions of Anatolia and the northern Mesopotamia.

The quantity of the figural plastic decreased in the portable material in the final Neolithic of Thessaly. Also, the figurines were more frequently made of stone while strong tendency to abstraction could be also recognized in this phase of the Neolithic and that is the constant also in the final Neolithic in the Balkan hinterland. The innovations in the repertoire of the Rahmani period are the summary executed figurines with a slot to insert the marble head. This is still another phenomenon, which links the Near East area with the Balkans but now at the very end of the Neolithic epoch.

The characteristic of the central Balkans in the Early Neolithic are simple and symmetric mostly standing figurines with emphasized glutei. Second group of figurines is of the pear-like shape and the third includes the schematized figurines of flat or cylindrical shape. S. Hansen distinguished the figurines from Zauan, Donja Branjevina, Endrod and Szajol as typical for this area. Large angular faces Hansen relates to the tradition of the Körös culture and recognizes in them

regional distinction in comparison to the Starčevo culture figurines. But, despite smaller distinctions he recognizes formal unity in the anthropomorphic figurines of the Starčevo- Körös- Criş cultural complex.

The anthropomorphic figurines from Macedonia and Albania in contrast to the area of the central Balkans and the southeast Europe reveal more details and greater tendency towards decoration and details. In addition, in this region are more popular figurines of larger size and particularly female figurines placed within the model house context. According to the investigations of the author of this review this association as well as some other, e.g. emphasizing the geometric ornaments or zigzag motifs, suggests strong connection of the female figures with the concept of *domus*. This could be seen not only on the figurines originating from the Macedonian sites (Madzare, Porodin) but also on the specimens from the Struma valley (Kovačevo), Greece (Sitagroi) or even from Anatolia (Höyücek). The figural plastic of the Neolithic period in this region has despite local divergences and distinctions all the characteristics of the Early and Middle Neolithic complex of the Balkan-Anatolian cultural circle.

The painted anthropomorphic vessel from Slatina, western Bulgaria represents according to S. Hansen the crucial link, which connects the cultures from such vast area. In other words it has excellent analogies with two complete anthropomorphic vessels from Hacilar I phase from that site. Furthermore, the figural plastic from Hacilar is very similar to the plastic of the Halaf period so Hansen demonstrates that distribution of the Neolithic throughout the southeastern Europe could be also followed in this way.

Particularly interesting is the chapter where Hansen discusses the notions of M. Gimbutas that have become extremely influential in the academic circles as well as among the groups of interest and movements like for instance is the *Great Goddess*. He raises a question: which are the elements of 'feminine' that were decisive for the importance, which was ascribed to them by the interpreters of M. Gimbutas type? The usual answer is 'fertility'. Most of the investigators think that female statuettes are materialization of the idea of fertility. Nevertheless, the paradigm of fertility is supported by too few archaeological contexts. When reading Hansen's book we got the impression that this idea is more the result of influences of the ethnological literature and the studies of J. Manhardt and J. Frazer where it was expanded and applied to the natural, economic, political and religious level. Unfortunately for the advocates of this opinion Hansen's analysis of a ratio between male and female figurines and their formal and symbolic characteristics does not support these theories. Regarding the quantity of figurines with male or female gender characteristics it is not possible to conclude that the female ones are prevailing. It is most probable according to the author's information that just those without pronounced gender dimorphism are prevailing. But, as the book we are discussing is just the first book of the kind in which almost complete amount of discovered statuettes is presented it is not unexpected that such bias actually exists. Drawing conclusions on the basis of impressions is not the method characteristic exclusively of the archaeologists. That is why this book is also very useful because it would be possible to confront in future any interpretation of the figural plastic with the archaeological material and precise statistic indicators.

The critiques of the book of S. Hansen are not numerous and could be justified at one hand taking into account the scope of this work and studied material, which obviously did not permit the autopsy of each and every specimen. Thus it could have happened to be reproduced the figurine from Zorlentul Mare (Taf. 271, 2) representing the reconstruction of double figurine without apparent elements for such reconstruction, which is even more strange because it represents two female figures, the original one and the reconstructed one.

Hansen also failed to emphasize one of the characteristics of the Vinča culture anthropomorphic figurines and these are unambiguous portrait features, which were possible to distinguish on a large sample originating from Belo brdo in Vinča. We realized after analyzing the faces of the figurines that personal and characteristic features were introduced within the strict canon and clear typological preferences, so there are almost not existing two figurines with identical faces. The portrait features, which are sometimes emphasized almost to the caricature, are achieved by modeling of the nose, position of the eyes and different angles on pentagonal faces. Similar tendency could be noticed on some other sites of the same cultural complex (see for example Hansen 2007, Taf. 270, p.1).

One of the objections is that author offered vague information concerning the elements offered by anthropomorphic figurines for the reconstruction of clothing, weaving techniques, hair style and body decoration and did not proceed further in the possible interpretation of these elements. However, the real focus of this work was the aspiration to clarify the role of these artifacts in the Neolithic and Eneolithic societies in the southeastern Europe so there will be other opportunities for the analysis of the figurines as sources for the study of everyday life.

When the shortcomings of technical character are concerned and if we leave out consistently incorrect quoting of the surname of M. M. Vasić I would mention the absence of legends for the tables in the second volume that makes the reading rather difficult. Also, it is not possible to determine on the basis of illustrations the material of which the figurine was made so the first volume must be consulted on that issue. In the same context could be mentioned lacking of the subject index that makes orientation in this large and complex work slightly more difficult.

The book of Svend Hansen besides the mentioned shortcomings is valuable and indispensable work for all future investigators of the Neolithic period in the vast area from the Jordan valley to Transylvania. His analysis makes possible still another consideration of the material culture evolution in this part of the world. When after reading or better to say studying this book we close its hard blue covers we remain excited in the face of many millennia long existence of the devised artistic approach and the expressive power of its male and female protagonists immortalized in clay. We are grateful to S. Hansen who invested great effort and no less spirit and intuition to systematize many aspects of the anthropomorphic figurines. We are also astonished because of the fact that except relatively few anthropomorphic figurines, which found their way to the publications and exhibition galleries, the large amount of these finds did not get the place adequate to their importance. The Hansen's book tries to investigate and explain the phenomenon of the Neolithic and Chalcolithic figurines and of-

fers them to the art historians as the foundation on which the ensuing European civilizations were to develop.

Svend Hansen, *Bilder vom Menschen der Steinzeit*, Archäologie in Eurasien 20, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Eurasien-Abteilung, Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 2007.

Tek ponekad dogodi se da vas neka knjiga očara toliko da je ne ispuštate iz ruku dok je celu ne pročitate. Takođe se tek ponekad dogodi da vam neka stručna knjiga priredi takvo zadovoljstvo i usput uštedi mesece mukotrpnog rada, obilaska brojnih muzeja i studije stotina i stotina, ponekad teško dostupnih predmeta i naslova. Knjiga Svenda Hansena *Bilder vom Menschen der Steinzeit* u izdanju Evroazijskog odela Nemačkog arheološkog instituta je upravo takvo štivo. Sveobuhvatnost i studioznost dodatno pružaju sigurnost svima onima koji će se ubuduće prihvatiti analize figuralne plastike, znajući da je referentna bibliografska jedinica već pred nama.

Podnaslov ove knjige, organizovane u dva toma, *Untersuchungen zur anthropomorphen Plastik der Jungsteinzeit und Kupferzeit in Suedosteuropa* ograničava ovo istraživanje na prostor jugoistočne Evrope u vreme neolita i bakarnog doba. Ipak, autor čini napor i svoje izlaganje počinje uvodnim poglavljima posvećenim antropomorfnosti plastici paleolita i neolita zapadne Azije, centralne i zapadne Anadolije i neolita Grčke, kako bi nas uveo u specifičnu ali brojnim međusobnim vezama isprepletenu problematiku pojave i procvata figuralne plastike u jugoistočnoj Evropi. Činjenica je da figuralna plastika neolita i bakarnog doba jugoistočne Evrope predstavlja najsveobuhvatniji ikonografski korpus u celoj praistoriji Evrope ali je ipak, osim najatraktivnijih primeraka, on do pojave Hansenove knjige bio prilično zapostavljen. Tokom poslednjih decenija i novijih arheoloških istraživanja broj primeraka figuralne plastike je po Hansenu značajno premašio 30.000! Upravo i iz tog razloga knjiga koja je pred nama stiže u pravo vreme.

Tokom svoje elaboracije S. Hansen se zalaže za konačno odvajanje činjenica od špekulacija kako bi se na problem antropomorfne plastike moglo gledati na objektivni način, te kako bi se izbegao bias koji je posledica razvoja etnologije i istorije religije XIX veka opterećene primarnom impresijom i analogijama na prvi pogled. Ovo je dakle jedan od prvih radova u kojima je učinjen pokušaj da se uzdigne iznad postojećih (i zastarelih?) hipoteza o značaju i ulozi antropomorfne plastike koje smo do sada imali prilike da čitamo u stručnoj i još više u popularnoj literaturi. Ukratko, u prvom slučaju radi se o interpretaciji antropomorfne figuralne plastike kao svedočanstva matrijarhata "stare Evrope", ili kao predstava "Velike Boginje". U drugom slučaju, pak, ona se vidi kao osnovna komponenta "revolucije simbola" do koje je došlo s početkom neolitskog perioda. U oba slučaja se figurinama daje značajna, ako ne i presudna uloga u rekonstrukciji neolitskog sistema verovanja. Takođe je u oba slučaja prejudicirana i njihova

kulturna uloga, te se one najčešće svrstavaju u okvir neke od varijanti kulta plodnosti. Hansenov stav je da stvari nisu tako jednostavne, te da se figurine najpre moraju sistematizovati, analizirati i na osnovu tako dobijenih rezultata postaviti hipoteze nezavisne od nasleđenih presumpcija. S. Hansen posmatra figuralnu plastiku kao autentični umetnički odraz epohe, čime omogućava bavljenje bitnim sociokulturnim aspektima i pitanjima vezanim za njen nastanak, izgled i razvoj. Odličnu analizu S. Hansen iznosi i kada je reč o socijalnoj uslovljenosti nastanka i promene u figuralnoj plastici, pa tako ističe da proces sedentarizacije u izvornim oblastima neolitske civilizacije koincidira s početkom produkcije ovih predmeta koji se na samom početku oslobađaju nekih prethodnih stereotipa, da bi u novom materijalu i mnogo slobodnije izražavale simbolične poruke i duh epohe. Sa druge strane, autor ovog dela se ni jednog trenutka ne zavarava da će se na ovaj način doći do definitivno iskristalisanih stavova, već samo do novih i ponekad neočekivanih mogućnosti tumačenja, ali isto tako i do uspostavljanja jasnih dometa u interpretaciji, što je takođe od izuzetne važnosti za pravilno proučavanje ovih umetničkih tvorevina.

Svoju studiju i interpretaciju antropomorfne plastike S. Hansen zasniva na četiri osnovna elementa arheološke analize koja su ovde dosledno primenjena: stil, tipologija, arheološki kontekst nalaza i distribucija u vremenu i prostoru. Kada raspravlja o stilskim odlikama, Hansen se bavi proporcijama tela, modelovanju posebnih delova tela, karakterističnom načinu ukrašavanja i sličnim aspektima. Ovaj način analize je neznatno dopunjen metod koji se koristi prilikom studiranja umetničkih predmeta i među arheolozima i među istoričarima umetnosti. Kada je reč o tipološkoj analizi, Hansen pod terminom "tip" podrazumeva način na koji je figurina predstavljena, odnosno da li je ona sedeća, stojeća, zavaljena, s rukama prekrštenim na grudima ili ispod njih, ili su ruke raširene. Pri tome se namerno izbegava finija podela tipova, pošto bi svako dalje nijansiranje bilo primenjivo na pojedinačne oblasti i podfaze, a ne na celokupni region Bliskog istoka i jugoistočne Evrope, te bi se na taj način oslabio utisak jedinstvenog porekla ovog fenomena. Arheološki kontekst najvećeg broja otkrivenih figurina je bolna tačka celokupne neolitske arheologije, jer je tek mali broj korektno publikovan, s detaljno navedenom dokumentacijom i precizno naznačenom provenijencijom.

Distribuciju ovih predmeta gotovo da nije moguće uspostaviti osim u najgrubljem smislu: da su oni najčešće skoncentrisani na naselje, te da ih nema kao grobnih priloga. U okviru naselja one se nalaze kako u kućama i izvan njih, tako i u jamama, nivelacijama i kulturnom sloju, što je, kako izgleda, karakteristika oba posmatrana regiona. Iako, prema iznetim stavovima i postavljenim ciljevima, primarni interes ove studije nije funkcija antropomorfne plastike, već odgojetanje njenog značaja u životu i kulturi drevnih zajednica, S. Hansen na osnovu dostupnih podataka izvlači zaključak da su figurine verovatno bile korišćene tokom kratkog vremenskog intervala i to u različite svrhe. S ovim zaključkom se ne moramo neminovno složiti, s obzirom na to da se može dati još objašnjenja za ovakvu distribuciju. Neki od uzroka za uočene distribucije figurina mogu biti: nivelacija, sekundarno korišćenje objekata, neprecizna terenska istraživanja, manjak kvalitetne dokumentacije i sl. Prostorna i hronološka distribucija figuralne plastike predstavlja četvrti element u Hansenovom arheološkom pristupu. On

ljudsku likovnost i sklonost ka predstavljanju ljudskog lika vidi kao konstantu i smatra da je u ovom slučaju praistorijska arheologija u položaju da zahvaljujući antropomorfnj figurálnoj plastici doprinese dijahronom posmatranju i razumevanju ovog fenomena. Korpus figuralne plastike on vezuje za istočno mediteranski kulturni krug i navodi da se tokom cele praistorije izvan ove oblasti gotovo i ne javljaju ovakve umetničke tvorevine.

U posebnom poglavlju S. Hansen analizira primere paleolitske plastike. Pri tom se pojava figuralne umetnosti u periodu srednjeg i poznog paleolita vezuje za nastanak organizovanih i specijalizovanih zajednica lovaca na velike životinje. Takav način lova zahtevao je specijalizaciju i bolju organizaciju društava koja su osim umetničkih predmeta za sobom ostavila i velike kampove i trajnije nastambe u nalazištima Kostenki, Dolni Vestonice i Pavlov. Prema Hansenu, ovakva složenija društvena organizacija bila je pogodno tlo za nastanak prve figuralne plastike. Međusobna uslovljenost i međuzavisnost društvene organizacije i masovne produkcije figuralne plastike vidi se nadalje i u naglom prestanku proizvodnje figurálnih umetničkih predmeta, koja je ponovo uslovljena promenom u subzistenciji, odnosno prestankom lova na mamuta i druge velike sisare.

Kada je reč o prostorima prednje Azije (Levanta), figuralna umetnost pojavljuje se u Natufijenskom periodu, i to takođe kao posledica povećanja naselja, populacionog rasta, delimične sedentarizacije i privredne specijalizacije. Efekat povećanog broja individua koje žive na jednom ograničenom prostoru, što je posledica procesa sedentarizacije, izaziva i socijalne konflikte, a time i potrebu da se na njih odgovori jasnom delineacijom prostora, grupe, individue. Figuralna plastika, kako to to iz ovog ugla izgleda, idealan je dodatak u ovim nastojanjima.

Transformacija figuralne plastike prolazi kroz odlučujući trenutak tokom predkeramičkog neolita (PPNA) kada se "pognute" figure paleolitskog perioda pretvaraju u uspravne s glavom upravljenom naviše (kamena figurina iz Mureybat, Sirija i terakota iz Netiv Hagdud, Izrael). U ovom periodu se po S. Hansenu definitivno formira "stereotipni način neolitske likovnosti" koji će odrediti kasniji razvoj figuralne umetnosti. U narednoj fazi prekeramičkog neolita (PPNB) došlo je do pojave novih elemenata koji će takođe biti utkani u budući razvoj figurina na celom prostoru od Levanta do Balkana. Reč je o predstavi ženske figure s rukama prekrštenim ispod grudi. Termin "stereotipni način neolitske likovnosti" S. Hansen čak uzdiže do nivoa onih inovacija koje, kao i tehnologija glačanog kamena, proizvodnje keramike ili domestikacije životinja i biljaka, jasno demarkiraju ova dva velika razdoblja rane ljudske prošlosti.

Za proučavanje antropomorfne figuralne plastike jugoistočne Evrope od velikog značaja je istraživanje neolitskih nalazišta u Anadoliji. Stanje istraženosti na ovom prostoru nije na zadovoljavajućem nivou, iako je tokom poslednjih par decenija istraživani znatan broj nalazišta i objavljeno nekoliko značajnih publikacija. Ipak, moguće je na osnovu do sada istraženih nalazišta, i uz neke specifičnosti koje se javljaju, potvrditi raniju pretpostavku da Anadolija predstavlja most između Istoka i Balkana. Ovo se može potvrditi i u plastici, ali i u ornamentalnom sistemu ukrašavanja grnčarije (Kurucay, Hacilar, Hoyucek). Činjenica da figuralne plastike nema na severozapadu Anadolije govori da su putevi širenja neolitskih tradicija ka Balkanskom poluostrvu, barem u prvom trenutku, verovatno zaobišli ovu oblast.

Heterogenost grčkog kopna Hansen opaža i u rano neolitskom periodu. Neolit sa svim svojim karakteristikama punim sjajem cveta u Tesalskoj ravnici, a slično se dešava i u nešto severnijoj oblasti Solunskog zaliva. Brojne antropomorfne figurine pokazuju da je ovdje i taj vid umetničkog izraza omiljen. S. Hansen naglašava da ranoneolitske figurine s ovog prostora u svemu imaju paralelu s "uzorima" na Bliskom istoku. Međutim, izgleda da bi u području južno od Volosa, na Atici i Peloponezu situacija mogla biti drugačija. U tim oblastima figuralna plastika nije ni izdaleka tako česta, mada to može biti i posledica neravnomerne istraženosti u ovim oblastima. Ukoliko se prihvati Hansenovo mišljenje o presudnom uticaju socijalnih faktora koji reflektuju intenzivan kolektivni život s potrebom demarkacije ličnog i kolektivnog, onda možemo zaključiti da je jug Grčke bio bez izraženih socijalnih napetosti, što je opet moglo biti uslovljeno relativno slabom naseljenošću tog prostora. U ovom radu je još jednom potkrepljena činjenica da tesalska varijanta neolita zapravo predstavlja sponu ka kulturama koje u isto vreme, ili sa malim zaostatkom, postoje u Makedoniji, Albaniji, dolini reke Strume, na centralnom Balkanu ili čak u Transilvaniji. Figuralna umetnost i naročito antropomorfnu plastika doživljavaju na Tesalskom tlu veliki uzlet. Figurine su izuzetno dobro izrađene i imaju širok spektar tipova koji se bez izuzetka može pratiti sve do Anadolije i severne Mesopotamije.

S finalnim neolitom Tesalije dolazi do opadanja zastupljenosti figuralne plastike u pokretnom materijalu. Takođe se tokom ove faze neolita figurine sve češće prave od kamena, a može se zapaziti i jaka tendencija ka apstrakciji, što predstavlja konstantu finalnog neolita i u unutrašnjosti Balkana. Novitet u repertoaru u periodu Rahmani su sumarno izrađene figurine s mestom u koje se postavlja mermerna glava. Ovo je još jedna od pojava koje povezuju prostor Bliskog istoka s Balkanom, ali se sada radi o samom kraju neolitske epohe.

Centralnobalkanski prostor u doba ranog neolita odlikuju jednostavne i simetrične, u najvećem broju stojeće figure, s uvećanim gluteima. Druga grupa figura je kruškolika, a treća su šematizovane figurine, ravne ili cilindrične forme. Kao tipične za ovaj prostor S. Hansen izdvaja figurine iz Zauana, Donje Branjevine, Endroda i Szajola. Velika uglasta lica Hansen vezuje za tradicije kulture Köres i u njima nalazi regionalnu razliku u odnosu na figurine Stračevačke kulture. I pored manjih razlika on vidi formalno jedinstvo u figuralnoj plastici kulturnog kompleksa Starčevo-Körös-Kriş.

Za razliku od prostora centralnog Balkana i jugoistočne Evrope, figuralna plastika Makedonije i Albanije pokazuje više detalja i veću usmerenost ka ukrašavanju i detaljima. Osim toga, u ovom regionu postoji sklonost ka figurama većeg formata i posebno ka postavljanju ženske figure u kontekst modela kuće. Prema istraživanjima autora ovog prikaza ova asocijacija, kao i neke druge, npr. isticanje geometrijskih ukrasa, ili cik-cak motivi, ukazuju na jaku vezu ženskih figura s konceptom *domusa*. Ovo se vidi ne samo na figurinama koje potiču s makedonskih nalazišta (Madžare, Porodin), već i na onima iz doline Strume (Kovačevo), Grčke (Sitagroi) ili čak iz Anadolije (Höyücek). I pored lokalnih divergencija i osobenosti, figuralna plastika neolitskog perioda ove oblasti ima sve odlike kompleksa ranog i srednjeg neolita Balkansko-Anadolskog kulturnog kruga.

Slikana antropomorfnu posuda iz Slatine u zapadnoj Bugarskoj predstavlja po S. Hansenu ključnu kariku u povezivanju kultura s ovako širokog prostora.

Naime, ona ima odlične analogije s dvema celim antropomorfnim posudama iz faze Hacilar I s ovog nalazišta. Nadalje, figuralna plastika iz Hacilara ima velike sličnosti s plastikom perioda Halaf, te Hansen na taj način pokazuje da se i ovim putem može pratiti širenje neolita po prostranstvima jugoistočne Evrope.

Posebno interesantno je poglavlje u kome Hansen razmatra stavove M. Gimbutas koji su postali izuzetno uticajni i u naučnim krugovima i u krugovima interesnih grupa i pokreta, kakav je npr. *Great Goddess*. On postavlja pitanje: kakvi su to elementi "ženskog" koji su bili odlučujući za značaj koji im sledbenici M. Gimbutas pripisuju? Najčešće je odgovor "plodnost". Najveći broj istraživača smatra da su ženske statuete upravo izraz ideje plodnosti. Pa ipak, premalo je ubedljivog arheološkog konteksta koji bi bio potvrda toj paradigmi plodnosti. Čitajući Hansenovu knjigu stičemo utisak da je ova ideja više rezultat uticaja etnološke literature i studija J. Manhardt-a i J. Frazera, kod kojih je ona proširena i aplicira se na prirodni, ekonomski, politički i religiozni nivo. Nažalost po zastupnike ovog načina mišljenja, Hansenova analiza brojčanog odnosa muških i ženskih figurina, kao i njihovih formalnih i simboličkih karakteristika, ne ide u prilog ove teorije. Što se brojčanog odnosa predstava sa muškim, odnosno ženskim polnim karakteristikama tiče, nije moguće zaključiti da ženske dominiraju. Prema Hansenovom uvidu najverovatnije je da dominiraju upravo one bez naznačenog polnog dimorfizma. No, budući da je knjiga koja je pred nama tek prva studija ove vrste u kojoj se na jednom mestu prikazuje gotovo celokupan fundus otkrivenih statueta, nije neočekivano da takav bias uopšte i postoji. Donošenje zaključaka na osnovu primarne impresije nije metod svojstven samo arheologima. Upravo zato je ova knjiga i korisna, pošto će na osnovu nje svaka interpretacija figuralne plastike ubuduće moći biti sučeljena s arheološkim materijalom i konkretnim statističkim pokazateljima.

Zamerke na knjigu S. Hansena nisu brojne i mogu se opravdati s jedne strane obimom rada i posmatranog materijala koji očigledno nije dozvoljavao autopsiju svakog pojedinačnog predmeta. Tako se i moglo dogoditi da bude preuzeta figurina iz Zorlentu Mare (Taf. 271, 2) koja predstavlja rekonstrukciju dvojne figurine bez jasnih elemenata za ovakvu interpretaciju, koja je utoliko čudnija što prikazuje dve ženske figure, jednu u originalu a jednu u rekonstrukciji.

Hansen je propustio da istakne jednu od značajnijih karakteristika vinčanske figuralne plastike, a to su nedvosmislene portretne crte, koje je bilo moguće ustanoviti na velikom uzorku koji potiče s Belog brda u Vinči. Analizirajući lica figurina uviđamo da se u okviru strogog kanona i jasnih tipoloških preferencija unose crte ličnog i karakterističnog, te skoro da ne postoje dve figurine s istim licima. Najčešće se modelovanjem nosa, položajem očiju i različitim uglovima na petougaonim licima postižu portretne crte koje su ponekad izvedene do karikaturalnog. Slična tendencija uočava se i na nekim drugim nalazištima istog kulturnog kompleksa (v. npr. Hansen 2007, Taf. 270, p.1).

Jedna od zamerki bila bi da je autor pružio sumarni uvid u elemente koje figuralna plastika daje za rekonstrukciju odeće, tkanja, frizure i načina ukrašavanja tela i nije išao dalje u moguću interpretaciju istih. Želja da se osvetli uloga i svrha ovih predmeta u društvima neolita i eneolita jugoistočne Evrope je ipak bila fokus ovog rada te će za analizu usmerenu na figurine kao izvor za studiju svakodnevnog života biti neke druge prilike.

Od nedostataka tehničke prirode, ako izuzmemo dosledno netačno citiranje prezimena M. M. Vasića, pomenuo bih nedostatak potpisa ispod tabli u drugom tomu, što otežava čitanje. Takođe, na osnovu ilustracija nije moguće utvrditi od kog materijala je figurina napravljena, te se mora uzeti prvi tom i u njemu tražiti razjašnjenje. U ovom kontekstu može se pomenuti i odsustvo pojmovnog indeksa, što otežava snalaženje kroz ovo obimno i kompleksno delo.

Knjiga Svenda Hansena i pored navedenih primedbi predstavlja vredno i nezaobilazno delo za sve buduće istraživače neolitskog perioda s čitavog prostora od doline Jordana do Transilvanije. Ovde iznesena analiza omogućava još jedan, mogli bismo reći suptilniji uvid u razvoj materijalne kulture ovog dela sveta. Kada posle čitanja, ili bolje rečeno studiranja ove knjige, zatvorimo njene tvrde plave korice, još dugo ostajemo pod utiskom veoma dobre percepcije jednog osmišljenog višemilenijumskog umetničkog pristupa i ekspresivne snage njegovih u glinu uhvaćenih protagonista i protagonistkinja. Osećamo zahvalnost prema S. Hansenu koji je uložio veliki napor i ne manje duha i pronicljivosti u sistematizaciju brojnih aspekata koje antropomorfna figuralna plasika poseduje. Osećamo takođe i čuđenje zbog činjenice da, osim relativno malog broja primeraka figuralne plastike koji su našli svoj put do publikacija i izložbenih galerija, velika masa ovih nalaza do sada nije imala mesto adekvatno svome značaju. U celini ova, Hansenova knjiga predstavlja veoma uspešan iskorak u istraživanju i objašnjenju fenomena neolitskih i halkolitskih figurina. Ona arheolozima i istoričarima umetnosti nudi jednu dobro osmišljenu viziju umetničke potke i osnove na kojoj će se razvijati potonje evropske civilizacije.

Nenad N. Tasić

Boris Olujić, *Povijest Japoda. Pristup* (The history of the Iapodes. The Approach). Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2007. Pp. 299, 2 appendices, list of abbreviations, bibliography, indices of geographic terms and personal names, note about the author, 16 color plates including 3 maps. Hardcover. 170 HRKn (= 23 €). ISBN: 978-953-6979-37-0.

The people that today we know under common plural designation 'the Iapodes' are, for the time being, the most fortunate people of ancient Illyricum. There are already a few different monographs in the new century dedicated to them¹, now including Olujić's *History of the Iapodes*, which is discussed here. This book is the final product of the research done on Olujić's (henceforth O.) PhD thesis on the Iapodes as the people between the La Tène and Mediterra-

¹ B. Raunig, *Umjetnost i religija prehistorijskih Japoda*. Monographs. Akademija Nauka i Umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine/Centar za Balkanološka Ispitivanja LXXXII/8. Sarajevo 2004; D. Balen-Letunić, *Arheološka svjedočanstva o japodskoj kulturi u posljednjem pretpovijesnom tisućljeću*. Ogulin 2006.

nean, in the period between the 5th and 1st centuries B.C., accomplished at the Universities of Zagreb and Sorbonne in Paris, including the subsequent archaeological fieldwork of the author.

It is hardly possible to stress enough just how significant this book really is, regardless of its occasional methodological shortfalls and inconsistencies. I do not think that it is an over-exaggeration to state that the *History of the Iapodes* represents a landmark in the research of group identities in pre-Roman Illyricum. The methodological framework used for the research of pre-Roman identities in this area still rests on a combination of Iron age archaeological cultures, onomastic groups determined from Roman-era native names, and ancient literary sources that deal with the area². This methodology, originally developed in the 1960s, is long overdue, and the new approaches are not only welcome, indeed they are a necessary and urgent task that impatiently wait for the upcoming generation of scholars³.

The approach to ethnicities and identities within the ancient world significantly changed in the 1980s and especially in the 1990s in ancient history and archaeology. The new developments could be, very arbitrarily and subjectively, divided into archeological and literary. They attempt to understand the weaknesses of literary and material sources, and to develop a more coherent and realistic view of ancient identities. The archeological developments are mostly focused on the criticism of the earlier Kossina/Childe culture/history archaeological framework that used artifacts of material culture to determine the ethnicity of those who used them⁴. New interpretations break out from the earlier tradition, emphasizing the significance of social context in which those artifacts existed, and regarding ethnicity as a subjective, social construct of the group. The social interaction between 'Us' and 'Them' is recognized as the context where ethnicity has been constructed, in accordance with the influential theories of the Norwegian anthropologist F. Barth⁵. The other line of recent scholarly criticism in archaeology is directed towards the influence of contemporary 19th and 20th century nationalist ideology on the interpretation of archaeological evidence from antiquity and the early medieval period⁶.

² See A. Benac, O etničkim zajednicama starijeg željeznog doba u Jugoslaviji. In: A. Benac (ed.), *Praistorija Jugoslovenskih Zemalja*. Vol. 5: Željezno doba. Sarajevo 1987, 737-802 and M. Šašel-Kos, *Appian and Illyricum*. Situla 43. Ljubljana 2005, 223 ff. for a recapitulation of existing scholarship.

³ D. Džino, Deconstructing 'Illyrians': Zeitgeist, changing perceptions and the identity of peoples from ancient Illyricum. *Croatian Studies Review: Journal and Bulletin of the Croatian Studies Centre in Sydney* 5-6, 2007 (forthcoming).

⁴ The level of criticism varies, Graves-Brown/S. Jones/C. Gamble (eds.), *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: The construction of European communities*. London, New York 1996; S. Jones, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing identities in the past and present*. London 1997; S. Brather, *Etnische Interpretationen in der frühgeschichtlicher Archäologie: Geschichte, Grundlagen und Alternativen*. Berlin, New York 2004.

⁵ F. Barth, Introduction. In: F. Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Bergen 1969, 9-38 cf. more recent assessment of the framework; H. Vermeulen/C. Govers (eds.), *The anthropology of ethnicity: Beyond 'Ethnic groups and boundaries'*. Amsterdam, Hague 1994.

⁶ P. L. Kohl/C. Fawcett (eds.), *Nationalism, politics and the practice of archaeology*. Cambridge 1995; M. Díaz-Andreu/T. Champion (eds.), *Nationalism and archaeology in*

The literary developments are concerned with contextual criticism of written sources and the impact of colonial discourse. They are significantly influenced by postcolonial theory and in particular the works of E. Said, which showed how the West constructed the 'Orient' through the discursive corpus of literature. The 'Orient' as such in reality never existed but was rather used as a mirror, defining what the West is, through its perception of the 'Other'⁷. Cartledge, drawing upon the earlier work of Hartog, successfully used this approach in his groundbreaking study of classical Greek identity, explaining the Greek invention of 'Barbarian' as a tool for determining what is in fact Greek and the development of 'Greekness'⁸. This approach was also used to deconstruct ethnic discourses developed by Greek and Roman 'ethnography' and explain the process of construction of the 'Celts' or 'Germans' as artificial creations of ancient Mediterranean intelligentsia, rather than real identities of the peoples in question⁹.

Back to O.'s book, where there is much to be said. Overall, it has a reasonably coherent structure (although longer and differently constructed chapters would be clearer to follow), dealing with different approaches to the research of prehistoric communities we know today as the Iapodes. In his approach O. emphasizes the critical study of ancient written sources and archaeology, but also deals with the space inhabited by the Iapodes, its geomorphologic characteristics and ancient perspectives of that space. The book is, in O's own words, a case study of the Iapodean community in its temporal and spatial context (p. 14) and in that regard it achieves successful outcomes.

The first chapter deals with the theoretical framework of research on ethnic communities, and is an upgrade of O's earlier publication.¹⁰ It is a very thorough survey of existing views on ethnicity of the peoples of Illyricum, with emphasis on former-Yugoslav scholarship, so that the views of scholars outside that circle, such as G. Alföldy or J. J. Wilkes have not been mentioned in the survey. The chapter also goes through O's (over)cautious criticism of the Kossina/Childe framework (pp. 19-20), the introduction of Said's 'Orientalism' (pp. 21-2)

Europe. London 1996; H. Härke (ed.), *Archaeology, Ideology, and Society: The German Experience*. Frankfurt a. M., Berlin, Bern 2000; M. Hardt/C. Lübke/D. Schorkowitz (eds), *Inventing the Pasts in North Central Europe: The National Perception of Early Medieval History and Archaeology*. Bern 2003, etc.

⁷ E. Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London 1978.

⁸ P. Cartledge, *The Greeks: The portrait of Self and Other*. Oxford 1993; F. Hartog, *Le miroir d'Hérodote: essai sur la représentation de l'autre*. Paris 1980 (the Greeks), and P. S. Wells, *The Barbarians Speak: How the conquered peoples shaped Roman Europe*. Princeton 1999; I. M. Ferris, *Enemies of Rome: Barbarians through Roman Eyes*. Stroud 2000 (the Romans).

⁹ E. g. M. Chapman, *The Celts: the construction of a myth*. New York 1992; J. Collis, *The Celts: origins, myths & inventions*. Stroud 2003 (the 'Celts') or A. A. Lund, *Zur Germanenbild der Römer: Eine Einführung in die antike Ethnographie*. Heidelberg 1990 (the 'Germans').

¹⁰ B. Olujić, *Putovi i raskršća, prioriteti i perspektive u istraživanju etničkih skupina sjeverozapadnoga Ilirika*. In: M. Matijević (ed.), *Spomenica Filipa Potrebece*. Zagreb 2004, 87-96.

and Barthian-influenced instrumentalism and interactionism (pp. 15-6)¹¹, and finally, the current state of research on the identity of the peoples of Illyricum (pp. 22-4). The most important point of this chapter is O's decisive break with the perception of the static timelessness of 'barbarian' identities and an awareness that they constantly change through time and through the social context of interaction with the 'Other' (e.g. pp. 15, 105, 161). As much as this book is groundbreaking for introducing fresh new views in the debate on ethnicity in pre-Roman Illyricum, O. stays on the safe side of the argument, thus avoiding more controversial positions, or stronger criticism of ancient written sources. He argues for the change in approach toward group-identity in pre-Roman Illyricum, but also tries to stay out of developing new frameworks, the only exception being the suggestion of replacing the term 'tribe' with the much more relevant expression: 'ethnic community' (p. 15)¹².

In his approach O. combines two different and opposed schools of thought. First, Anglo-American scholarship that emphasizes the dynamic nature of identity and its social, interactive background, focusing on dialectics of social change in time and the impossibility of discussing the ethnicity of the group only through material evidence.¹³ Throughout the book O. constantly reminds the reader that Iapodean ethnicity changes and evolves through time, affected by Mediterranean and Continental influences and the interaction with neighbors. However, O.'s approach also has a distinctively French bouquet that is related more to the *longue durée* perspective and a constantly present undercurrent that tradition and geography somehow influence a continuity of culture and a continuance of identity. French historiography and archaeology remains suspicious of post-modernistic views of ethnicity, culture and identity – a rather surprising fact, taking into account the key impact of French thinkers such as Derrida, Lyotard, Bourdieu or Foucault on the development of new interpretative concepts in ancient history and archaeology¹⁴.

¹¹ It is a pity O. did not consult Barth's later works where he discussed culture as an abstraction of reality, shaking the homogeneity of his earlier 'Us' and 'Them': F. Barth, The analysis of culture in complex societies. *Ethnos* 54, 1989, 120-142. See also the criticism of Said's 'binarism' in relation to Foucault's concepts of power and discourse, which shows Said's inability to take into account the disproportionate relation of opposed subjects (us/them, self/other) in their relation to power, H. K. Bhabha, *Location of Culture*. London, New York 1994, 70-72.

¹² Cf. Olujić (n. 10) 89. Earlier, S. Čače, *Liburnija u razdoblju od 4. do 1. stoljeća prije nove ere*. PhD thesis. University of Split. Zadar 1985, 60-64 and recently D. Džino, *Delmati, vino i formiranje etničkog identiteta u predrimskom Iliriku*. VAPD 99, 2006, 73 n. 10.

¹³ E. g. Jones (n. 2), now also a very strong current in German and Eastern European archaeology – cf. Brather (n. 4); P. M. Barford, *Crisis in the Shadows: Recent Polish Polemic on the Origin of the Slavs*. *Slavia Antiqua* 44, 2003, 121-155; M. Bertašius, *The Archaeology of Group: From Situational Construct to Ethnic Group*. In: V. Lang (ed.), *Culture and Material Culture: Papers from the First Theoretical Seminar of the Baltic Archaeologists*. Tartu 2005, 29-38.

¹⁴ A. Coudart, *Is post-processualism bound to happen everywhere? The French case*. *Antiquity* 73, 1999, 161-167; J-P. Demoule, *Ethnicity, culture and identity: French archaeologists and historians*. *Antiquity* 73, 1999, 190-198.

The survey of existing works on the Iapodes (pp. 29-39) is brief and informative, welcome to every scholar interested in this area. The chapter on ethnogenesis of the Iapodes (pp. 43-9)¹⁵ is followed by a brief and neutral overview of their material culture (pp. 53-62). O.'s main point is that the period of the late Bronze Age and early Iron Age decisively determined the shape of what will become the Iapodes and Iapodean culture. This view is reminiscent, perhaps unintentionally, of the positions of Bromley's interpretation of ethnogenesis, which argues that ethnicity is based on a stable core (*ethnos*) that does not change through changing social formations, despite being visibly affected by contemporary economic and/or political circumstances¹⁶. Ethnogenesis is a strongly contested concept in contemporary scholarship, but regardless of his consciousness of this ongoing debate, O. still chooses to place a strong emphasis on this concept¹⁷. Personally, I disagree with O. as I think that he puts on the 'Braudellian glasses' that he himself describes (p. 43), instead of focusing on the more important socio-political aspects of Iapodean group identity-construction, whether or not this identity-construction deserves to be regarded as 'Iapodean ethnicity'.

This approach is repeated later in the book when O. deals with the space inhabited by the Iapodes, their material culture and funerary customs, seeing their ethnicity as culturally determined through the continuity of their settlements, material culture, organization of the space and funerary customs (p. 49). True, throughout the book O. tries on occasions to balance the social and cultural context of identity-construction (e.g. pp. 105-6, 135, 215-6), yet his structural emphasis remains firmly on the cultural context and tradition and the social context of identity construction receives nothing but scant recognition. The search for the development of a political organization, and the relationship between the individual Iapodean communities would be more beneficial from the assessment of their cultural continuity. Culture is constructed and negotiated in social space and should be examined in this context, because "... *culture is positioning, not an essence*"¹⁸. Therefore, if the scholarship want to understand ancient 'Iapodeness' it should regard it primarily as a socio-political construct, separate from their cultural continuity.

¹⁵ This is an upgrade of his earlier work, B. Olujić, *Ethnie, culture, identité: problemes de l'origine des Iapodes et des Liburniens (âge du Bronze, âge du Fer)*. In: P. Cabanes (ed.), *L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Épire dans l'Antiquité III, Actes du IIIe colloque international de Chantilly*. Paris 1999, 57-60.

¹⁶ F. Curta, *From Kossinna to Bromley: ethnogenesis in Slavic archaeology*. In: A. Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnicity in the Early Middle Ages*. Turnhout 2002, 201-218, cf. M. Banks, *Ethnicity: Anthropological constructions*. London, New York 1996, 17-23.

¹⁷ The issue of ethnogenesis is currently hotly debated in early medieval history, but it is applicable to ancient history as well cf. A. Gillett, *Ethnogenesis: A Contested Model of Early Medieval Europe*. *History Compass* 4/2, 2006, 241-260; S. Tabaczynski, *Procesy etnogenetyczne: doswiadczenia badawcze archeologii i przyszłość*. In: M. Miśkiewicz (ed.), *Slowianie w Europie wczesniejszego sredniowiecza. Katalog wystawy*. Warsaw 1998, 79-99, or S. Ćirković, *Srednjevekovno razdoblje u tzv. etnogenezi balkanskih naroda*. In: N. Budak (ed.), *Etnogeneza Hrvata*. Zagreb 1995, 29-39 (quoted by O.).

¹⁸ S. Hall, *Cultural identity and diaspora*. In: J. Rutheford (ed.), *Identity*. London 1990, 226; cf. J. Friedman, *Cultural Identity & Global Process*. London 1994, 67-77; Barth (n. 11) etc.

The discussion of literary sources is divided into two chapters: The earliest mentions of the Iapodes (pp. 63-70) and Iapodean conflicts with the Romans (pp. 71-102). The first chapter analyses the earliest mentions of the Iapodes. There O. rightly concludes that there is no hard evidence to confirm the Iapodean presence in Italy, and that all written evidence dealing with the Iapodes before the 2nd century BC is at best, weak and questionable (pp. 65-9). In the other part he deals with the Roman conflicts with the Iapodes (pp. 73-84), focusing in particular on Octavian's expedition in 35 BC (pp. 85-102), which has received detailed attention recently¹⁹. This chapter does not offer much more than a recapitulation of the sources and of previous scholarship, apart from an intriguing, but not necessarily convincing, revised view of the nature of Iapodean political institutions. O. argues that the Iapodes were a united political entity, so according to him the Cisalpine and Transalpine Iapodes, mentioned by Appian, are in fact Roman constructions related only to Octavian's campaign of 35/34 BC (pp. 87, 95-6, 219). This opinion of O. contrasts the earlier orthodoxy that recognized two different political identities amongst the Iapodes²⁰.

The most innovative and undoubtedly most thrilling chapter is entitled 'Iapodean space' and is heavily influenced with Braudelian links of intertwined time and space and post-Foucault interpretative dialectic of space, time and social being (pp. 103-76)²¹. O. analyses the space because in his words the space impacts the political, cultural, economic and social development of the people who inhabit it (p. 135). This chapter essentially deals with the location of the space inhabited by the Iapodes, combining archaeology (pp. 107-17) and ancient literary constructions of the Iapodean space (pp. 118-34). Surprisingly, but rightly, O. makes a firm anti-Braudelian stand on the function of the mountains as a link rather than a barrier to cultural influences (pp. 135-43), although I am not quite sure that we should see them exclusively either way²². The settlements of the Iapodes are covered in the next sub-section (pp. 144-59) where O. provides a substantial and well-informed insight into the settlement pattern of Iapodean space. However, O. rightly warns his reader that much more work has to be done in the future, on establishing the relationship between settlements and their interaction. The last part of this chapter is on funerary customs of the Iapodes, and is an upgrade of O's earlier work that dealt with the construction of their identity through funerary customs (pp. 160-76)²³.

O. also deals with the isolated issues of Iapodean 'Illyro-Celtic' origins (pp. 177-86), the influences from the Mediterranean (pp. 187-94) as well as the Iapodes in the Roman era (pp. 195-212), which is followed by the final remarks (pp.

¹⁹ Treated in depth by Šašel-Kos (n. 2) 422 ff.

²⁰ E.g. S. Čače, *Prilozi proučavanju političkog uređenja naroda sjeverozapadnog Ilirika*. *Radovi Filozofskog Fakulteta u Zadru* 18/8, 1979, 55 ff.; Šašel-Kos, (n. 2) 422-437.

²¹ E. Soja, *Postmodern geographies: the Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London 1989.

²² J. R. Macneil, *The Mountains of the Mediterranean World*. New York, Cambridge 1992 that O. relies upon, but also P. Horden/N. Purcell, *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History*. Oxford 2000, 80-82, both opposing F. Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*, Vol. 1 (2nd ed.). Paris 1966, 22-47.

²³ B. Olujić, *Grob kao znak i poruka – Japodski svijet mrtvih*. *Histria Antiqua* 8, 2002, 73-84.

213-22). The discussion of the 'Illyro-Celtic' origins of the Iapodes moves this long-lasting discussion into new and exciting territory, acknowledging that they did not belong to ancient pseudo-ethnic stereotypes of 'Illyrians' or 'Celts' nor were they a 'mixture', but constructed a specific, unique identity (p. 185). The excursus on Mediterranean influences deals with the Iapodes inside the process of Mediterranean globalization, which complements the earlier discussion on 'Celtic' influences. O. makes a very plausible conclusion that the Iapodes were already part of the process of ancient Mediterranean globalization, long before the Roman conquest (pp. 187-94)²⁴. The part on the Iapodes under Rome does not offer more than a recapitulation of the existing pieces of evidence, including personal names, inscriptions and Roman roads. This is certainly not a focal point of this book, and we may hope that it will be a focus of O's research in the future, especially in matters of social transformations and acculturation that came with Roman rule (p. 212), including the hybridization of local cult of Bindus²⁵.

Maps and illustrations have their function, although too much emphasis has been unnecessarily given to the landscapes in the plates. Also, the plates and illustrations are not numbered. The book is accompanied by two appendices, Appendix 1 (pp. 223-7) very clearly lists all the phases of Iapodean material culture with the objects that characterize them as well as major archeological localities. Appendix 2 (pp. 231-6) brings forth all the written sources that mention the Iapodes, in the translation of Bruna Kuntić-Makvić. Typographical errors are very rare, such as the omission of the reference RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ 1968 from the Bibliography, or the publication year for White's Loeb translation of Appian's *Roman History* cited as 1982-90 instead of 1912 (p. 243). Also, the map of the Iapodean localities (Plate 14) is difficult to read, because of the small and unintelligible font.

O.'s knowledge of former-Yugoslav scholarship is superb, and the book is accompanied with an impressive bibliography that includes numerous recent archaeological, historical (including medieval and contemporary history), geological and sociological references. However, a few significant works outside of former-Yugoslav scholarship are unfortunately omitted in the bibliography, especially those that deal with the Graeco-Roman perception of the 'Other' such as Dauge's capital work on 'barbarian anthropology', or the more recent deconstruction of pseudo-ethnic constructions of antiquity such as the 'Celts', or 'Germans'²⁶. Keeping in mind the strong Braudelian influences throughout the book, his absence from the bibliography is notable, especially in the part, which deals with geography and Mediterranean influences on the Iapodes. The book would

²⁴ Cf. the similar point raised by Zaninović in the case of the Delmatae; M. Zaninović, The Ancient cultural unity between the central Adriatic littoral and the Dalmatian hinterland. In: M. Sanader, A. Rendić-Miočević (eds.), Religion and myth as an impetus for the Roman provincial culture: The proceedings of the 8th international colloquium on problems of Roman provincial art. Zagreb 2005, 275-280.

²⁵ Most recently, I. Popovic, L'iconographie et le culte de la divinite iapode Bindus Neptune. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique – Suppl. 38. Paris 2000, 423-428.

²⁶ Y. A. Dauge, *Le Barbare: Recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilization*. Collection Latomus 176. Bruxelles 1981. See above (n. 9) for the 'Celts' and 'Germans'.

also profit from the more recent studies of the Mediterranean such as the monumental anti-Braudelian Purcel/Horden's monograph²⁷. O's reliance on postcolonial theory through Said's 'Orientalism' and his use of the concept of 'Othering' stays his structural weakness without decisive employment of a contextual and genre criticism of ancient written sources²⁸, and without more emphasis on the discursive nature of 'Othering' that is discussed by Said's followers²⁹. A theoretical discussion on the nature of ethnicity and identity would also benefit from the works of A. D. Smith³⁰, and Bourdieau's sociological concept of *habitus*, which is becoming quite significant in archaeological theory³¹.

O. reconstructs the lapodes from the abyss of proto-historical darkness, but does not deconstructs them, staying far away from the conclusions and the development of new interpretative frameworks. It is a well-done case-study, but it sorely needs other comparable studies of the neighboring peoples that would help in the construction of a new framework for a study of peoples from pre-Roman Illyricum. This book is a significant piece of scholarship, it is very informative, and contains well-written material often going far beyond usual dry scholarly observations. It is intended primarily for the south Slavic audience, although its translation into some of the more influential world languages, with certain corrections and upgrades, would be a fine and welcome addition to the study of European proto-historical communities. We just need to cross our fingers that in the long run this book shall carry forth and unleash the 'virus of change' that will spread and cause a rethinking of the existing frameworks for research of Iron Age communities in the western Balkans.

Danijel Džino

Mirsad Sijarić, Mačevi 10.-15. stoljeća iz Bosne i Hercegovine, Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo, 2004, str. 108.

Analizirani na pravi način, mačevi, kao neizostavni dio opreme ratnika u srednjem vijeku, ali i simbol vlasti i moći tadašnjih gospodara, mnogo nam mogu reći o ratničkoj i svakodnevnoj praksi srednjovjekovnog čovjeka. Kao arheološki nalaz oni su jedan od najzahvalnijih predmeta, kako za opću obradu, tako i za tipološku i hronološku klasifikaciju. Međutim, domaća stručna literatura je ma-

²⁷ Horden/Purcell (n. 22); also W. V. Harris (ed.), *Rethinking the Mediterranean*. Oxford 2005.

²⁸ *Inter alii*: C. Shuttleworth Kraus (ed.), *The limits of historiography*. Mnemosyne Suppl. 191. Leiden 1999; K. Clarke, *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic constructions of the Roman world*. Oxford 1999; T. Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire*. Oxford 2001.

²⁹ E.g. J. Fabian, *Time and the Other: How anthropology makes its object*. New York 1983; S. Hall, *The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power*. In: S. Hall/B. Gieben (eds.), *Formations of Modernity*. Cambridge 1992, 275-332; S. Mills, *Discourse*. London 1997.

³⁰ A. D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford 1986.

³¹ E. g. Jones (n. 2).

čeve sasvim neopravdano tretirala samo usputno, te se sve do sada nije pojavio cjelovit prikaz ove vrste oružja. Izuzetak je knjiga Mirsada Sijarića o srednjovjekovnim mačevima u Bosni i Hercegovini, koja ustvari predstavlja njegov magistarski rad branjen juna 2004. godine na Filozofskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Pošto je Sijarić u svom ranijem radu, kojim se i predstavio znanstvenoj javnosti, izvršio temeljitu komparativnu analizu i katalošku obradu srednjovjekovnih mamuza ("Kasnosrednjovjekovne mamuze iz zbirke Zemaljskog Muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine", *GZM n. s. Arheologija*, 48/49, Sarajevo, 2001, str. 300-346.), moglo se i očekivati da će njegova knjiga, kao i navedeni rad, također biti urađena savjesno uz veliki obzir prema pojedinostima. Prema autoru, cilj ovog rada je "pružanje što potpunije slike nalaza mačeva 10.-15. st., sa prostora BiH, analiziranje i prezentiranje do sada nepublikovanih nalaza, te u par slučajeva revidiranje starih postavki u skladu sa novim saznanjima o ovoj problematici." (str. 7.), po čemu se ova knjiga može svakako svrstati u ozbiljan pokušaj da se naša nauka obogati novim rezultatima, koji su joj tako prijeko potrebni.

Od 17 analiziranih mačeva, veći broj ih se čuva u Zemaljskom Muzeju u Sarajevu, a obrađeni su i nalazi koji su pohranjeni u muzejima u Travniku, Visokom i Bijeljini. Oni predstavljaju primjerke izrađevina nađenih na tlu današnje Bosne i Hercegovine koji se mogu okvirno datirati u period između 10. i 15. stoljeća. Razlog za ovakvo vremensko ograničavanje obrađenih mačeva treba tražiti u činjenici da su se naši znanstvenici, koji su se bavili proučavanjem srednjovjekovnog oružja, a posebno nalaza mačeva, uglavnom orijentirali na predmete iz ranog srednjeg vijeka, gotovo zanemarujući one čija se izvedba i upotreba može datirati u kasniji period. Prilikom same obrade mačeva akcenat je stavljen na njihovu tipološku i hronološku klasifikaciju, koja je određivana prema procesu analize koju su nedavno u svojim radovima ustanovili brojni evropski autori (Geibig, Oakeshott i dr.). Imajući to u vidu, može se reći da su mačevi tretirani po propisima najnovijih standarda postavljenih u najvišim naučnim krugovima, čime navođeni argumenti u djelu dobivaju nesumnjivu težinu.

Analizirane mačeve autor je podijelio u dvije osnovne grupe; u grupu I svrstani su mačevi korišteni prilikom suočavanja sa kombiniranim, dok se u grupi II nalaze oni namijenjeni suprotstavljanju punim oklopima. S obzirom da je ova podijela rađena na osnovu razvoja odbrambenog sistema, tj. oklopa, koji svoje prve značajne promjene u konstrukciji, u smislu usavršavanja, dobijaju krajem 13. stoljeća, tako se i na mačevima, kako bi odgovarali pomenutoj promjeni, javljaju stilske i funkcionalne promjene na sječivu i balčaku. U skladu s tim, mačeve druge grupe, u odnosu na one iz prve, karakterizira novi oblik jabučica, te pojava središnjeg ispupčenja na sječivu, tj. rebra, koji ojačava vrh ili cijelo sječivo.

Iz cijele skupine analiziranih mačeva valja izdvojiti nekoliko primjeraka; posebno su zanimljivi prvi i drugi po redu obrađeni mačevi koji pripadaju prvoj grupi i koji su bili namijenjeni za sječū (tj. suprotstavljanje kombiniranim oklopima). Naime, oba mača se ističu interesantnim natpisima na sječivu koji ih u tipološkom smislu klasificiraju u mačeve poznate skupine INGELRII, što je ustvari signatura porajnskih kovačkih radionica, vjerovatno iz okolice današnjeg grada Solingena, čiji mačevi potiču iz perioda od 10. do sredine 11. stoljeća. Posebnu skupinu analiziranih mačeva čine i tri mača iz prve grupe (redni bojevi 5, 6. i 7.), koji se odlikuju svojom veličinom, masivnošću i vrlo dugim, ravnim sječi-

vima, i koji su kao i prethodni razmatrani mačevi služili za sječu. Iz ove skupine se kao najinteresantniji još ističe mač koji je osobito karakterističan zbog toga što na obje strane sječiva ima sačuvane predstave heraldičkih znamenja. Ništa manje nije zanimljiv ni mač iz druge grupe (17. po redu analizirani mač) kojeg također valja izdvojiti zbog njegovog osobenog oblika zbog kojeg je prozvan "volovski jezik". Prema autoru ovaj mač je došao u Bosnu i Hercegovinu vjerovatno krajem 15. ili početkom 16. stoljeća iz Italije.

Neki opisani mačevi predstavljaju izuzetno vrijedne, neobične i rijetke primjerke. Međutim, neke je zub vremena toliko nagrízao da im nedostaju osnovni dijelovi čime je njihova klasifikacija znatno otežana (npr. četvrti analizirani primjerak, izvađen iz korita rijeke Save u Brezovom polju kod Brčkog, nema sačuvan balčak, kao ni gornji dio sječiva, dok je i preostali dio sječiva veoma slabo očuvan).

Zbog malobrojnosti mačeva nađenih na prostorima Bosne i Hercegovine, kao i zbog činjenice da većina njih uglavnom potiče iz zapadnih radionica i kovačnica (napose njemačkih, ali također i mađarskih i talijanskih), autor dolazi do zaključka da nije moguće iz dostupnog materijala odrediti po čemu su mačevi domaćih radionica, koji se spominju u pisanim izvorima (*spada I de Bosna*), bili prepoznatljivi u odnosu na slično oružje iz drugih zemalja. U svom zaključku autor povlači i pitanje mačeva kao grobnih priloga u srednjovjekovnoj Bosni, pozivajući se na neke primjerke nađene ispod stećaka, čijom bi se detaljnijom analizom mogla proučiti vjerska, ili možda čak i etnička pripadnost njihovih posljednjih vlasnika. U tom smislu kao posebno zanimljivu teoriju, koja zaslužuje dalju razradu, on ističe odnos stećaka i Vlaha, što bi moglo dati i konačan odgovor na brojne pretpostavke o mačevima u BiH.

Karakteristika cijelog djela jeste ta što autor, na osnovu najnovijih naučnih dostignuća, pravi brojna poređenja analiziranih mačeva s već opisanim nalazima mačeva sa drugih prostora, te među njima traži analogije i sličnosti, pri čemu pokazuje zavidno poznavanje literature, a samim time i cjelokupne problematike. Vrijednost ove knjige sastoji se i u tome što su mnogi mačevi opisani i predstavljeni po prvi put uz kvalitetne reprodukcije crteža i slika koje znatno pomažu čitatelju pri praćenju ponekad suhoparnog teksta. Cijela zbirka obrađenih mačeva stavljena je u širi, evropski okvir, jer je Sijarić uspješno dokazao da veći dio mačeva vodi porijeklo iz nekih od evropskih zemalja. Kako sam autor kaže, glavna manjkavost rada predstavlja nemogućnost da se obrade i analiziraju 5 ili 6 primjeraka mačeva koji se nalaze u muzeju u Banjoj Luci. Ova činjenica cjelokupnom djelu uopće ne smanjuje vrijednosti; metodološki dobro postavljeno i precizno obrađeno, s interesantnom tematikom, ono zaslužuje da postane važno i nezaobilazno referentno djelo za sve buduće istraživače koji se budu bavili proučavanjem kako materijalne kulture srednjovjekovne Bosne tako i ratnih prilika u njoj.

Emir O. Filipović