

## BRUNISLAV MARIJANOVIĆ: ENEOLITIK I ENEOLITIČKE KULTURE U BOSNI I HERCEGOVINI

Sveučilište u Mostaru, Pedagoški fakultet, Odsjek za arheologiju i povijest umjetnosti, Mostar 2003, 334 stranice uključujući 44 table, 33 slike, 2 karte i 3 plana

## BRUNISLAV MARIJANOVIĆ: ENEOLITHIC AND ENEOLITHIC CULTURES IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

University in Mostar, Faculty of Pedagogy, Department of Archaeology and Art History, Mostar 2003, 334 pages including 44 plates, 33 illustrations, 2 maps and 3 plans

Pod ovim naslovom objavljena je nova, inače druga knjiga Brunislava Marijanovića, profesora prehistorijske arheologije i arheološke metodologije na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zadru nedavno transformiranom u zadrsko Sveučilište i istodobno profesora na novoosnovanom studiju arheologije na Pedagoškom fakultetu (nedavno preimenovanom u Fakultet filozofsko-humanističkih znanosti) Sveučilišta u Mostaru. Knjiga predstavlja prerađenu disertaciju koju je autor pod naslovom *Eneolit Bosne i Hercegovine* obranio 1990. na Filozofskom fakultetu u Beogradu. Kao i prethodna, i knjiga koju imamo pred sobom objavljena je na hrvatskom jeziku s opsežnim sažetkom na engleskom, tako da je pristupačna širokom krugu arheologa.

Kao i u svojoj prethodnoj knjizi i u ovu autor nije poslije završetka rukopisa više unosi nove radove i mišljenja drugih arheologa, osim naravno svojih radova objavljenih čak do 2001. Kao primjer dovoljno je spomenuti da autor ne donosi radove Zilke Kujundžić-Vejzagić i Branke Raunig iz *Glasnika Zemaljskog muzeja* u Sarajevu za 2001. u kojima su prvi put objavljeni eneolitički nalazi u Pećini pod lipom na Glasincu i u Cazinu, a donosi svoj djelomično ponovljeni rad o Biogradu u Pruscu objavljen u istom vesku tog časopisa! Ni to nije sve. Oko 70 stranica teksta u poglavlju o Hercegovini doslovno je identično kao u prethodnoj autorovoj knjizi. Prilikom pisanja istog teksta za dvije knjige ili doslovnog prenošenja teksta iz jedne u drugu knjigu, autor nije ispravio neke bilješke tako da je došlo do apsurdne situacije u kojoj on nekoliko puta citira rukopis svoje disertacije koji upravo objavljuje (bilješke 221, 282, 319, 320 i 341) ili svoju prvu knjigu citira kao da je još u tisku i to s godinom 1998. (bilješke 307, 318, 322 i 339)! Isto tako, gotovo sve ilustracije nalaza već su objavljene u njegovim prijašnjim radovima i knjizi.

U uvodnom poglavlju autor piše o razlozima nastanka svoje knjige, odnosno okolnostima zbog kojih dosadašnje poznavanje eneolitika u Bosni i Hercegovini nije bilo potpuno. Ističe da se na tom prostoru tijekom eneolitika mogu izdvojiti dvije osnovne kulturne zone. Prvu čine Hercegovina i dinarsko-krško područje, koji su slijedili, kao i tijekom neolitika, razvojne procese na istočnoj jadranskoj obali. Druga je Bosna, koja je u cjelini bila uključena u procese koji su se odvijali na srednjobalkanskom i panonskom prostoru. Autor je u pravu što izdvaja dinarsko-krško područje (Livanjsko, Duvanjsko, Glamočko i Kupreško polje) koje

Under this title was published the new, second book by Brunislav Marijanović, professor of prehistoric archaeology and archaeological methodology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zadar, recently transformed into the Zadar University, and at the same time professor at the newly founded archaeology course at the Faculty of Pedagogy (recently renamed to Faculty of Philosophy-Humanities sciences) University in Mostar. The book is actually the author's adapted dissertation, which he defended in 1990 at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade under the title *The Eneolithic of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Like the previous one, the book that we have before us was published in Croatian, with an extensive summary in English, making it accessible to a wide circle of archaeologists.

As it was the very case with his previous book the author, after finishing his text, didn't record any more new articles not even opinions of other archaeologists, besides, of course, his texts that had been published even before 2001. To make an example it would be enough to mention that the author didn't use the articles of Zilka Kujundžić-Vejzagić nor Branka Raunig from the *Bulletin of Land Museum* in Sarajevo from 2001, where the Eneolithic finds from the cave Pećina Pod Lipom in Glasinac and in Cazin had been published for the first time, but, on the other hand, he quoted his partially revised article on Biograd in Prusac, that was published in the same volume of the very same journal. Nevertheless, this wouldn't be all, about seventy pages of his text about the chapter on Herzegovina is literally identical to the text from the author's previous book. On the occasion of writing the same text for two books, or his literal transferring of the text from one to his other book, the author failed to correct some notes. Thus, it created absurd situation, where he found himself quoting several times the text of his dissertation, which is in the very process of publishing (notes 221, 282, 319, 320 and 341), or is quoting his first book as it is still about to be published with the year 1998 (notes 307, 318, 322 and 339)! Following the same pattern, almost all illustrations of the finds have already been published in his previous texts and the book.

In the introductory chapter the author writes about the reasons underlying the creation of his book, i.e. circumstances due to which the previous knowledge of the Eneolithic in Bosnia and Herzegovina was incomplete. He points out that two basic cultural zones can be distinguished in this territory during the Eneolithic. The first comprises Herzegovina and the Dinaric-karst region, which followed, as they did during the Neolithic, the developmental processes on the eastern Adriatic coast. The second is Bosnia, which participated entirely in the processes un-

prirodnogeografski ne pripada ni Bosni ni Hercegovini i za koje je najprimjereniji naziv Zadinarje. Ipak, nije jasno na osnovi čega zaključuje da je Zadinarje tijekom eneolitika slijedilo razvojne procese na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u Hercegovini, jer u knjizi ne spominje nijedno nalazište s tog područja.

U drugom poglavlju autor prikazuje povijest istraživanja eneolitika u Bosni i Hercegovini, s težištem isključivo na naseljima, dok se na iskopane tumule osvrće u drugim poglavljima. Njegov pregled zahtijeva određene ispravke i dopune.

Kao početak istraživanja eneolitika u Bosni i Hercegovini ne može se uzeti godina 1893., kada je prema autorovoj tvrdnji František-Franjo Fiala počeo iskopavanja na Debelom brdu u Sarajevu, jer su iskopavanja na tom nalazištu počela još 1888. Sljedeće je godine Šime Ljubić objavio ostavu bakrenih sjekira iz Tolise, tako da već kraj 80-ih godina 19. st. treba uzeti kao početak istraživanja i proučavanja eneolitika u Bosni i Hercegovini. Također, 1906. nije otkriveno naselje u Donjoj Mahali kod Orašja već u Gornjem Klakaru kod Bosanskog Broda, a istraživao ga je Ćiro Truhelka.

Za razdoblje između dva svjetska rata autor nije naveo da je upravo tada, točnije 1924., otkriveno nalazište u Donjoj Mahali, zatim da je prve ulomke keramičkog posuđa prikupio i objavio Jozo Petrović, te da je tu Mihovil Mandić 1926. izveo zaštitno iskopavanje. Izostavio je spomen iskopavanja Vladislava Skarića na Gradcu u Lepenici kod Kiseljaka 1931. i 1932., gdje su otkriveni i eneolitički ostatci.

Za to su poglavlje, zbog naslova i sadržaja, suvišni i cinični autorovi komentari na danas ispravljene ili odbačene postavke Josipa Korošca o kulturnoj slici na nalazištu Crkvine u Turbetu kod Travnika, koje je iskopavao 1942. U isto vrijeme autor nije ni spomenuo, a kamoli naglasio kako su Korošćevi radovi o vučedolskoj kulturi, koje je on napisao i objavio tijekom svojeg rada u Sarajevu, u stvarnosti bili veliki teorijski napredak u proučavanju eneolitika u Bosni.

Iskopavanje u pećini Hrustovači u okolici Hrustova kod Sanskog Mosta Alojz Benac je izveo samo 1947., a ne i 1948. god. Za nalazište Zemunicu u Radosavskoj kod Banje Luke navedeno je da su ga iskopavali Zdravko Marić i Borivoj Čović 1964., ali ne i Zdenko Žeravica 1974. Za kompleksno nalazište Kastel u Banjoj Luci nije precizno navedeno da su ga iskopavali Irma Čremošnik i Z. Žeravica od 1972. do 1974. i da je iskopavanja nastavio Boris Graljuk od 1979. nadalje. Izostavljena su iskopavanja Milice Kosorić u okolici Bijeljine: na Brdu u Dvorovima 1963., na Njivama u Golom brdu 1977. te Velikom Gradcu kod Ostojićeva 1978. Također, nedostaju iskopavanja u drugim dijelovima Bosne: Borivoja Čovića na višeslojnom prethistorijskom naselju Pod kod Bugojna, gdje su između 1959. i 1969. godine otkriveni i djelomično istraženi ostatci kratkotrajnog eneolitičkog naselja, Orhana Jamakovića na Bijelića glavici u Gornjim Drugovićima kod Laktaša 1984. i 1985. i Gradini u Aginom Selu kod Banje Luke 1987., Blagoja Govedarice na gradini Klisuri u Kadića brdu kod Sokolca od 1985. do 1991., Envera Imamovića u Podastinju kod Kiseljaka 1987. i Branke Raunig u Cazinu 1991. Nabrojana

folding in the areas of the central Balkans and Pannonia. The author is right in distinguishing the Dinaric-karst region (the Livno, Duvno, Glamoč and Kupres Plains), which in terms of natural geography indeed does not belong to Bosnia and Herzegovina and for which the most appropriate name would be *Zadinarje* (Trans-Dinaric area). However, it is not clear on what grounds he concluded that during the Eneolithic Zadinarje followed the developmental processes on the eastern Adriatic coast and in Herzegovina, because his book does not mention a single site in that area.

In the second chapter the author presents a history of research of the Eneolithic in Bosnia and Herzegovina, focusing exclusively on settlements, whereas his thoughts regarding the excavated tumuli appear in other chapters. His survey requires certain corrections and elaboration on certain points.

The year 1893, when according to the author František-Franjo Fiala started excavating at Debelo Brdo in Sarajevo, cannot be taken as the beginning of research on the Eneolithic in Bosnia and Herzegovina because excavations at that site had started already in 1888. The following year Šime Ljubić published a hoard of copper axes from Tolisa, so that already the end of the 1880s should be considered the beginning of the research and study of the Eneolithic in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Further, the year 1906 does not mark the discovery of the settlement in Donja Mahala near Orašje but the one in Gornji Klakar near Bosanski Brod, excavated by Ćiro Truhelka.

Regarding the period between the two world wars, the author failed to mention that it was precisely then, in 1924 to be precise, that the site in Donja Mahala was discovered; that the first sherds of ceramic vessels were collected and published by Jozo Petrović and that Mihovil Mandić carried out a salvage excavation there in 1926. He does not mention Vladislav Skarić's excavation at Gradac in Lepenica near Kiseljak in 1931 and 1932, where eneolithic remains were also discovered.

Considering the title and content, in the case of this chapter, the author's comments on the now corrected or discarded theses by Josip Korošec regarding the cultural image at the site of Crkvine in Turbe near Travnik, which he excavated in 1942, are superfluous and cynical. At the same time the author does not even mention, let alone emphasise the fact that Korošec's works about the Vučedol Culture, which he wrote and published in the course of his work in Sarajevo, effectively represented a big theoretical step forward in the research on the Eneolithic in Bosnia.

The excavation in the Hrustovača cave in the surroundings of Hrustovo near Sanski Most was carried out by Alojz Benac only in 1947 and not in 1948 as well. Regarding the site of Zemunica in Radosavska near Banja Luka it is stated that it was excavated by Zdravko Marić and Borivoj Čović in 1964, but not that it was excavated also by Zdenko Žeravica in 1974. In the case of the complex site of Kastel in Banja Luka, it is not precisely stated that it was excavated by Irma Čremošnik and Z. Žeravica between 1972 and 1974 and that the excavations were continued by Boris Graljuk from 1979 onwards. The excavations by Milica Kosorić in the vicinity of Bijeljina were left out: at Brdo in Dvorovi in 1963, at Njive in Golo Brdo in 1977 and at Veliki Gradac near Ostojićevo in 1978. Likewise, excavations in other parts of Bosnia are lacking: those by Borivoj Čović at the multilayered prehistoric settlement at Pod near Bugojno, where between 1959 and 1969 the remains of a short-lived Eneolithic settlement were discovered and partially excavated; by Orhan

eneolitička nalazišta ne spominju se u tekstu (osim usput gradine Klisure u Kadića brdu) niti su označena na kartama u toj knjizi, za razliku od 10-ak drugih nalazišta na kojima arheološka iskopavanja nisu nikada izvedena, već su s njih samo prikupljeni površinski nalazi.

U poglavlju o metodološkom pristupu autor objašnjava razloge zašto za doba koje obrađuje upotrebljava naziv eneolitik, a ne neki drugi (npr. bakreno doba ili prijelaz iz neolitika u brončano doba), zašto kao početak eneolitika u Bosni i Hercegovini uzima završetak III. faze butmirske kulture, odnosno onaj relativnokronološki horizont koji se može s njim sinkronizirati, zašto ne prihvaća unaprijed postavljenu periodizaciju eneolitika po troperiodnom sustavu i zašto izlaganje počinje sažimanjem podataka o kasnoneolitičkom supstratu. Također, naglašava kako se u knjizi bavi samo materijalnom kulturom u užem smislu, prvenstveno keramičkim nalazima, a da o drugim aspektima – naseobinskim elementima, ekonomskoj strukturi, kultu, pokopavanju i sl. – neće biti riječi. Takav pristup proizlazi iz dva razloga: Prvo, najprije treba izvršiti, još uvijek nepostojeću, klasifikaciju i sistematizaciju cjelokupnog arheološkog materijala. Drugo, na današnjoj razini istraženosti eneolitika u Bosni i Hercegovini nije moguće dati neku zaokruženu sliku o drugim aspektima, a da se ne izbjegne pojednostavljanje prema načelu vjerojatne i moguće sličnosti s drugim istovrsnim pojavama u drugim dijelovima Balkana i u Panoniji. Iako svaki pristup treba poštivati, ipak je neobično da autor u knjizi nije donio tipološke table keramičkog posuđa niti se osvrnuo na mnogobrojne bakrene sjekire u Bosni i Hercegovini, posebno zato što svi tipovi nisu istodobni i mogu se, kao i keramički nalazi, svrstati u određenu etapu eneolitika, a pojedini tipovi čak vezati za određenu kulturu. Taj nedostatak popunjava knjiga Z. Žeravice u kojoj su, pored ostalih, objavljene i sve poznate bakrene sjekire iz Bosne i Hercegovine (Žeravica 1993).

Četvrto poglavlje ili prva velika tematska cjelina odnosi se na Hercegovinu. Svoja izlaganja autor počinje prikazom neolitičkog supstrata koji predstavlja hvarsko-lisičićka kultura, čiji su nositelji krajem neolitika inače naselili i rubne dijelove Bosne. Zatim donosi pregled 14 nalazišta u Hercegovini, ali svoja razmatranja i zaključke uglavnom zasniva na četiri nalazišta s izraženim slojevima bogatim keramičkim nalazima na kojima je izveo sustavna arheološka iskopavanja i čije je rezultate već objavio: Ravlića pećini iznad zaselka Peć-Mlina u Tihaljini kod Gruda, gradini Guvninama iznad zaselka Gagrica u Lokvama kod Čapljine, Hateljskoj pećini iznad zaselka Hatelja u Berkovićima i pećini Lazaruši u okolici Dabrice, obje kod Stolca. U svojoj recenziji njegove prve knjige iznio sam mišljenje o tri potonja nalazišta (Periša 2003), a na ovom mjestu ću ga još dopuniti. Podatci s ostalih nalazišta, prema autorovom mišljenju, potvrđuju ili dopunjavaju njegovu sliku razvojnih procesa. Zbog toga ću se najprije osvrnuti na neka od njih.

Iz eneolitičkog sloja u Zelenoj pećini iznad Blagaja kod Mostara autor objavljuje ulomak vrpčaste i tri ulomka žlijebljene keramike, koji su već bili objavljeni u nekoliko navrata, ali i ulomak ukrašen ljubljanskim stilom koji dosada

Jamaković at Bijelića Glavica in Gornji Drugovići near Laktaši in 1984 and 1985 and at Gradina in Agino Selo near Banja Luka in 1987; by Blagoje Govedarica at the Klisura hillfort in Kadića Brdo near Sokolac between 1985 and 1991; by Enver Imamović in Podastinje near Kiseljak in 1987 and by Branka Raunig in Cazin in 1991. These Eneolithic sites are not mentioned in the text (with the exception of a cursory mention of the Klisura hillfort in Kadića Brdo) nor are they marked on the maps in the book, in contrast to a dozen other sites where archaeological excavations have never been carried out at all, but from which only surface finds were collected.

In the chapter on the methodological approach the author explains the reasons why he uses the term *Eneolithic* for the analyzed period and not some other term (e.g. Copper Age or transition from the Neolithic to the Bronze Age); why he takes as the beginning of the Eneolithic in Bosnia and Herzegovina the end of the phase III of the Butmir Culture, that is the relative chronological horizon that can be synchronized with it; why he does not accept the previously established periodization of the Eneolithic according to the three-period system; and why he begins his exposition by summarizing data about the Late Neolithic substrate. Further, he points out that his book deals only with the material culture in the narrower sense, primarily ceramic artefacts, and that nothing will be said about other aspects – settlement elements, economic structure, cult, burial etc. This kind of approach stems from two reasons: First, one must begin with carrying out the still lacking classification and systematization of the entire archaeological material. Second, the present day level of research on the Eneolithic in Bosnia and Herzegovina offers no grounds for a comprehensive picture about other aspects, without avoiding simplification according to the principle of probable and possible analogies with other phenomena of the same type in other areas of the Balkans and Pannonia. Even though every approach merits respect, it is nevertheless unusual that the author should fail to present in his book the typological tables of ceramic vessels or to deal with the numerous copper axes in Bosnia and Herzegovina, all the more so because not all types are contemporary and can be, same as the ceramic finds, attributed to a specific Eneolithic phase, and in the case of certain types even to a specific culture. This void is filled by a book by Z. Žeravica, in which, among others, all the known copper axes from Bosnia and Herzegovina are published (Žeravica 1993).

The fourth chapter or the first large thematic unit is dedicated to Herzegovina. The author starts by presenting the Neolithic substrate, represented by the Hvar-Lisičići Culture, whose bearers settled the peripheral parts of Bosnia towards the end of the Neolithic. He then gives a survey of 14 sites in Herzegovina, but bases his observations and conclusions mostly on four sites with prominent layers rich in ceramic finds on which he carried out systematic archaeological excavations, the results of which he already published: Ravlića Pećina above the Peć-Mlina hamlet in Tihaljina near Grude, the Guvnine hillfort above the Gagrice hamlet in Lokve near Čapljina, Hateljska Pećina above the Hatelji hamlet in Berkovići and the Lazaruša cave in the vicinity of Dabrica, both near Stolac. In my review of his first book I stated my opinion regarding the last three sites (Periša 2003), and here I shall elaborate on it. The information from other sites, in the author's opinion, confirms or supplements his view of the developmental processes. Therefore I shall first direct my attention to some of these.

nije bio objavljen, a bio je kamen spoticanja u tumačenju kulturne pripadnosti eneolitičke faze tog nalazišta (Marijanović 1991a, 227). Upravo je zbog toga trebao objaviti, a ne samo spominjati (str. 60-61, bilj. 156 i 158) i ostale ulomke, jer to je bila jedinstvena prilika. Dalje, on smatra da je postojala posebna eneolitička faza, ali nije točno da ona nije nikako bila zastupljena u periodizaciji A. Benca, jer je on najmlađu fazu okvirno pripisao eneolitiku i ranom brončanom dobu (Benac 1957, 83). Pa i nova periodizacija i numeracija slojeva, koje predlaže B. Marijanović, nisu sasvim precizne, jer se može i treba izdvojiti i srednjeneolitička faza.

Iz uništenog eneolitičkog sloja u pripečku Badnju u Borojevićima kod Stolca potječe nekoliko ulomaka keramičkog posuđa. Ulomak s tunelastom ručkom, ukrašen ljubljanskim stilom, autoru je svojedobno bio toliko zanimljiv i značajan da mu je posvetio svoj prvi rad u kojem se bavio eneolitikom u Hercegovini (Marijanović 1978). Samo usput spominjem da taj, neosporno zanimljiv ulomak posude i tipološki i ukrasno ima bliske paralele s jednim primjerkom iz Iga na Ljubljanskom barju (Korošec 1967, T. III,1), što autor još uvijek nije uočio.

Pećina Jejinovača u Berkovićima kod Stolca bila je korištena kao kratkotrajno stanište u nekoliko razdoblja tako da u njoj ne postoje kulturni slojevi. Prisutnost nekoliko ulomaka keramičkog posuđa s trbušastim donjim dijelom i cilindričnim vratom, a posebno rijetki primjerci koji imaju prstenasto zadebljane obode, autoru je bio dovoljan dokaz za zaključak kako je pećina bila korištena i u eneolitiku. Bez stratigrafije i ilustracija svrstavanje tih nalaza u eneolitik treba uzeti s rezervom, jer se takve posude i prstenasto zadebljani obodi pojavljuju i u rano brončano doba, a u toj su pećini inače nađeni i ulomci posuške kulture.

U Manastirskoj pećini kod Trebinja nađeni su ulomci od samo dvije keramičke posude koje autor datira u razvijeni eneolitik. Sudeći po priloženim ilustracijama (T. XXIX,1-2) takav je zaključak ishitren i neutemeljen. Lonci sa šiljastim bradavicama na ramenu do sada nisu nađeni u eneolitičkim, već samo u slojevima iz ranog i početka srednjeg brončanog doba (Garašanin, Garašanin 1959, 246, sl. 5; Forenbaher 1987, 90-91, T. 1,6). Isti je slučaj i s posudama koje imaju široku trakastu ručku postavljenu odmah ispod oboda. Zbog toga te nalaze treba svrstati u brončano doba, a s obzirom na geografski položaj, pripisati posuškoj kulturi.

U pećini Greben kod Trebinja nađen je ulomak gornjeg dijela posude ukrašen visećim, horizontalno šrafiranim trokutima, izvedenim nazubljenim kotačićem (T. XXX,1). Budući da autor ne komentira taj nalaz, treba reći da ukras, zasada, nalazi svoje paralele jedino u Retz-Gajary kulturi i to na jednoj posudi iz Velike pećine kod Višnjice u Hrvatskom zagorju (Dimitrijević 1980, T. 4,1). Je li taj način ukrašavanja na istočnu jadransku obalu i u njezino zaleđe došao istim putem kao i ljubljanski stil, ostaje otvoreno pitanje.

Iako je autor u nekoliko svojih radova pisao o ranom eneolitiku na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu, ipak je u knjizi koju imamo pred sobom najiscrpnije obradio tu temu. Odmah na početku podsjeća da su Stojan Dimitrijević i Nikša Petrić prvi upozorili i na mogućnost i na potrebu izdvajanja jedne kategorije keramičkih nalaza iz

From the Eneolithic layer in Zelena Pećina above Blagaj near Mostar the author published a sherd of corded ware and three sherds of grooved ware, which had already been published on several occasions, but also a previously unpublished sherd decorated in the Ljubljana style, which was a bone of contention regarding the interpretation of the cultural attribution of the site's Eneolithic phase (Marijanović 1991a, 227). This is precisely why he ought to have published instead of merely mentioning (pp. 60-61, notes 156 and 158) the remaining sherds, as this was a unique opportunity. Further, he believes that there indeed was a separate Eneolithic phase, but it is not true that it was absolutely absent from the periodization by A. Benac, because he attributed the latest phase in general terms to the Eneolithic and Early Bronze Age (Benac 1957, 83). In fact, the new periodization and numbering of layers proposed by B. Marijanović are not entirely precise, because one can and should distinguish a Middle Neolithic phase as well.

The destroyed Eneolithic layer in the rockshelter of Badanj in Borojevići near Stolac yielded several sherds of ceramic vessels. A sherd with a tunnel-shaped handle, decorated in the Ljubljana style, was at one time so interesting and important to the author that he dedicated his first article dealing with the Eneolithic in Herzegovina (Marijanović 1978). I shall briefly mention that this undeniably interesting vessel sherd has close typological and decorative analogies with a specimen from Ig at Ljubljansko barje (Korošec 1967, Pl. III,1), which the author still fails to notice.

The Jejinovača cave in Berkovići near Stolac was used as a short-time residence in several periods so that it contains no cultural layers. The presence of several ceramic vessel sherds with a bellied lower part and a cylindrical neck, and particularly the rare specimens with ring-like thickened rims, were proof enough for the author to conclusion that the cave was used also during the Eneolithic. The lack of stratigraphy and illustrations renders the attribution of these finds into the Eneolithic rather uncertain, because such vessels and ring-like thickened rims appear also during the Early Bronze Age, and this cave also yielded sherds belonging to the Posušje Culture.

In Manastirska Pećina near Trebinje sherds from only two ceramic vessels were found, dated by the author into the Advanced Eneolithic. Judging by the published illustrations (Pl. XXIX,1-2), this conclusion is hasty and unfounded. Pots with pointed warts on the shoulder have not been found so far in Eneolithic layers, but only in those from the Early and the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age (Garašanin, Garašanin 1959, 246, Fig. 5; Forenbaher 1987, 90-91, Pl. 1,6). The same applies to the vessels with a wide strap handle positioned immediately below the rim. These finds should, therefore, be attributed to the Bronze Age and, taking into account the geographic position, to the Posušje Culture.

In the Greben cave near Trebinje a sherd from the upper part of the vessel was found, decorated with hanging, horizontally hatched triangles, executed by means of an indented wheel (Pl. XXX,1). As the author does not comment the find at all, it should be mentioned that the decoration, for the time being, can find analogies only in the Retz-Gajary Culture, more precisely on a vessel from Velika Pećina near Višnjica in the Hrvatsko Zagorje region (Dimitrijević 1980, Pl. 4,1). The question remains open as to whether this decorative method arrived in the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland via the same route as the Ljubljana style.

Although the author wrote about the Early Eneolithic on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland in several of his works,

Grapčeve i Markove spilje na otoku Hvaru, koju su obuhvatili pojmom kanelirane keramike i vezali je za početak eneolitika na istočnoj jadranskoj obali. Ipak, ne spominje temeljni rad u kojem je S. Dimitrijević prvi put izdvojio i objavio sve do tada raspoložive nalaze kanelirane keramike (ali i one ukrašene okomitim plastičnim rebrima i nizom kratkih ureza) s tih nalazišta (Dimitrijević 1970). Autor dalje piše da ta nalazišta ne pružaju velike mogućnosti zbog nedovoljno pouzdane stratigrafske slike, ali ne zapaža ili ne uvažava podatke dobivene novijim revizijskim iskopavanjem u Grapčevoj spilji (Forenbaher, Kaiser 2000, 17-18). Svoju analizu i zaključke zasniva na stratigrafiji Ravlića pećine i pećine Lazaruše te još nekoliko nalazišta na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu.

Arheolozi koji su se do sada bavili tom problematikom razilazili su se u tumačenju porijekla kanelirane keramike (vinčanska, butmirska, badenska i Bubanj-Salčuća) i kulturnom opredjeljenju horizonta u kojem se ona pojavljuje (kasna hvarsko-lisičićka ili nova tzv. nakovanska kultura). Nasuprot tome, prilično su usuglašeni u mišljenju da od trenutka pojavljivanja kanelirane keramike treba računati i s početkom eneolitika na istočnoj jadranskoj obali. Autor piše da je jedino A. Benac bio protiv ne samo izdvajanja nove kulture već i protiv datiranja kanelirane keramike u rani eneolitik. Međutim, A. Benac je ipak ispravio svoje ranije mišljenje i smatrao da kanelirana keramika u kasnoj hvarsko-lisičićkoj kulturi obilježava početak eneolitika na tom području, ali nije bio precizan u pogledu porijekla kaneliranja u toj kulturi. Naime, za njega kaneliranje u kasnoj hvarsko-lisičićkoj kulturi nije bilo ništa neobično, budući da je takav način ukrašavanja u neolitik i eneolitik bio široko rasprostranjena pojava (Benac 1991, 263).

B. Marijanović vrlo iscrpno i uvjerljivo opisuje proces eneolitizacije hvarsko-lisičićke kulture. Činjenica da kanelirano keramičko posuđe obilježava neolitička tehnologija i da se daleko najveći broj tipova kreće u okvirima hvarsko-lisičićke kulture, nedvojbeno ukazuje na pripadnost toj kulturi. S druge strane, porijeklo kaneliranja u toj kulturi treba tražiti isključivo u badenskoj i Bubanj-Salčuća kulturi. Uvođenje i prevlast ukrašavanja kaneliranjem podudara se s vremenom koje je na najvećem broju hvarsko-lisičićkih naselja obilježeno degenerativnim procesima koji se očituju smanjivanjem, a zatim nestankom ukrasnog sustava svojstvenog klasičnoj fazi te kulture koja pripada neolitiku.

Treba spomenuti da je nedavno i Stašo Forenbaher objavio pregledni sintetski rad o ranom eneolitiku na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu (Forenbaher 1999-2000). Njegovo stavljanje naziva nakovanska kultura pod navodnike nije prouzrokovano njegovom sumnjom u postojanje samostalne kulture s tim imenom, već ciničnim stavom koji dovodi u pitanje ili isključuje opravdanost i naziva i pojma *kultura* u prehistorijskoj arheologiji. S druge strane, on ne poznaje neke od najvažnijih radova o toj temi (Benac 1991; Marijanović 1991; Marijanović 1992), tako da mu je proces eneolitizacije na tom području prilično nejasan ili nepoznat.

Sva razmatranja i zaključke o razvijenom eneolitiku u Hercegovini B. Marijanović je doslovno prenio iz svoje prethodne knjige. Budući da sam svoje mišljenje o tome već

this topic receives its most thorough treatment in the book before us. At the very beginning he reminds us that Stojan Dimitrijević and Nikša Petrić were the first to draw attention also to the possibility and necessity of distinguishing a certain category of ceramic finds from Grapčeva Spilja and Markova Spilja on the island of Hvar, to which they applied the term "cannelured ware" and linked it with the beginning of the Eneolithic on the eastern Adriatic coast. However, he does not mention the seminal work in which S. Dimitrijević singled out and published for the first time all the available finds of cannellured ware (but also those decorated with vertical plastic ribs and a series of short incisions) from those sites (Dimitrijević 1970). The author further writes that those sites are of no great potential on account of the insufficiently reliable stratigraphic picture, but he does not notice or consider the data obtained by recent revisory excavations in Grapčeva Spilja (Forenbaher, Kaiser 2000, 17-18). He bases his analysis and conclusions on the stratigraphy of Ravlića Pećina and the Lazaruša cave and several more sites on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland.

The archaeologists that have been dealing with this set of problems did not agree in the interpretation of the origins of the cannellured ware (the Vinča, Butmir, Baden and Bubanj-Salčuća) and the cultural attribution of the horizon in which it appears (the late Hvar-Lisičići or the new so-called Nakovana Culture). In contrast to this, there is a high degree of agreement in the opinion that from the moment of appearance of cannellured ware one has to reckon with the beginning of the Eneolithic on the eastern Adriatic coast as well. The author writes that only A. Benac was opposed not only to the distinction of a new culture but also to the dating of the cannellured ware into the Early Eneolithic. However, A. Benac at last corrected his earlier opinion and came to believe that the cannellured ware in the late Hvar-Lisičići Culture marks the beginning of the Eneolithic in that area, but he was not precise with regard to the origin of cannellures in that culture. He found nothing unusual in the presence of the cannellures within the late Hvar-Lisičići Culture, because this method of decoration was a widely distributed phenomenon during the Neolithic and Eneolithic (Benac 1991, 263).

B. Marijanović is very thorough and convincing in his description of the process of the eneolithization of the Hvar-Lisičići Culture. The fact that the cannellured ceramic vessels are characterised by Neolithic technology and that by far the largest number of types is present within the Hvar-Lisičići Culture, undeniably indicates affiliation with this culture. On the other hand, the origin of cannellures in this culture should be sought exclusively in the Baden and Bubanj-Salčuća cultures. The introduction and dominance of cannellured decoration corresponds to the period that is marked, on the largest part of the Hvar-Lisičići settlements, by degenerative processes resulting in the diminishing and subsequent disappearance of the decorative system characteristic for the classical phase of this culture, which belongs to the Neolithic.

It should be mentioned that Stašo Forenbaher recently also published a review synthetic paper about the Early Eneolithic on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland (Forenbaher 1999-2000). The fact that he put the name Nakovana Culture in quotation marks is not due to his doubts regarding the existence of an independent culture with that name, but rather due to a cynical standpoint that questions or denies the justification of both the name and term *culture* in prehistoric archaeology. On the other

iznio u spomenutoj recenziji, nema potrebe da to ponavljam, već čitatelje upućujem na taj tekst. Ovdje ću dati samo neke dopune.

U slojevima razvijenog eneolitika u Hateljskoj pećini (III. faza) i pećini Lazaruši (II. faza) nađen je po jedan ulomak vrata posude s identičnim ukrasima žlijebljenih paralelnih horizontalnih linija i ovalnim cik-cak ubodima (T. XVII,2, T. XXV,3). Autor nigdje ne spominje podudarnost između ta dva ulomka, iako njihova usporedba upućuje da je ulomak iz Hateljske pećine također bio vrlo blizu oboda posude, a samim time da je naopačke nacrtan. Taj sam ulomak u svojoj recenziji njegove prve knjige slučajno previdio i on ispravlja moj navod da je u sloju III. faze Hateljske pećine nađen samo jedan ulomak posude ukrašen u kombinaciji sa žlijebljenjem, ali ne osporava moje mišljenje da drugi ulomak iz sloja III. faze i ulomak ukrašen u kombinaciji sa žlijebljenjem iz ranobrončanodobnog sloja, odnosno naredne IV.a faze pripadaju cetinskoj kulturi. Pravolinijski žlijebljeni ukras na ulomku na T. XVII,2 također ne osporava moje mišljenje, već samo ide u prilog njemu, da ulomak ukrašen žlijebljenim koncentričnim krugovima iz sloja IV.a faze jest eneolitičko nasljeđe, ali ne i nasljeđe iz III. faze Hateljske pećine.

Veliku pozornost i dosta prostora autor je ponovno posvetio ukrašenom poklopcu i ulomku bogato ukrašene posude iz sloja II. faze u Lazaruši, prenoseći iz prethodne knjige tekst, ali ne i ilustracije (Marijanović 2000, 158-159, 175-176, sl. 9-10). U svojoj prethodnoj recenziji dao sam mišljenje o poklopcu, ali iz opravdanih razloga to nisam učinio za drugi nalaz, pa to sada nadoknađujem.

Autor smatra kako je ta posuda u tipološkom pogledu vrlo bliska odgovarajućim oblicima vučedolske kulture. Međutim, ne izjašnjava se je li riječ o loncu ili dubokoj zdjeli, a uz ilustraciju nema presjeka profila posude, niti mjerila. U organizaciji ukrasa na njezinoj vanjskoj površini izdvajaju se dvije zone: uska gornja, s nizovima suprotno postavljenih žigosanih trokuta i široka donja površina, s gusto žlijebljenim linijama poredanima u okomitim nizovima, tako da prave motiv riblje kosti. Autor uočava da je gornji ukras moguće promatrati u kontekstu istovrsnih ukrasa ljubljanske kulture na jednoj i vučedolske kulture na drugoj strani. Ističe da povezivanje tog ukrasa s jednom od te dvije kulture izgleda nerješivo, jer razlike u toj vrsti motiva u objema kulturama gotovo da i nema. Dojmu nerješivosti pridonosi i prisutnost posuda u Lazaruši ukrašenog ljubljanskim stilom, ali i onog s barbotinskim ukrasima, čije porijeklo autor vezuje za vučedolsku kulturu. Ipak, autor smatra da gornju ukrasnu zonu treba promatrati zajedno s njezinim tipološkim obilježjima, a to znači i povezati je s vučedolskom kulturom, jer mu se ne čini logičnim tipološka obilježja povezati s jednom, a ukrasna obilježja, odnosno jedan njihov dio, s drugom kulturom. Za donju ukrasnu zonu autor piše kako neodoljivo podsjeća na tipične ukrase Černavoda III. kulture – veličina ukrasnog polja u odnosu na raspoloživu površinu, tehnika izvođenja i kompozicija motiva gotovo su isti. Ističe da se bilo kakvom čvršćem povezivanju nalaza iz Lazaruše i Černavoda III. kulture protivne problemi kronološke naravi i prostornog položaja te kulture.

hand, he is not familiar with some of the most important works on this topic (Benac 1991; Marijanović 1991a; Marijanović 1992), so that the process of eneolithization in that area is rather unclear or unknown to him.

B. Marijanović literally transferred the discussion and conclusions about the Advanced Eneolithic in Herzegovina from his previous book. As I have already expressed my opinion on this in the mentioned review there is no need to repeat it here, so I shall direct readers to that text. Here I shall only make certain additions.

In each of the layers of the Advanced Eneolithic in Hateljska Pećina (phase III) and the Lazaruša cave (phase II) a sherd was found from the neck of a vessel with identical decorations of grooved parallel horizontal lines and oval zigzag stabs (Pl. XVII,2, Pl. XXV,3). There is no mention by the author of any correspondence between these two sherds, even though their comparison indicates that the sherd from Hateljska Pećina was also positioned very close to the rim of the vessel, and by this very fact also that it was drawn upside down. In my review of his first book I accidentally overlooked that sherd and he corrected my statement that in the layer of the phase III of Hateljska Pećina there was only one vessel sherd decorated in combination with grooving; however, he does not challenge my opinion that the second sherd from the layer of the phase III and the sherd decorated in combination with grooving from the Early Bronze Age layer, i.e. the subsequent phase IVa, belong to the Cetina Culture. The rectilinear grooved decoration on the sherd on Pl. XVII,2 also does not call my opinion into question but rather speaks in favour of it, that the sherd decorated with grooved concentric circles from the layer of the phase IVa indeed is of Eneolithic legacy, but not at the same time the legacy from the phase III of Hateljska Pećina.

The author once again devotes quite a lot of attention and space to the decorated lid and the sherd of a richly decorated vessel from the layer of the phase II in Lazaruša, transferring the text from the previous book, but not the illustrations (Marijanović 2000, 158-159, 175-176, Fig. 9-10). In my previous review I stated my opinion about the lid, but for certain, justified, reasons I did not do the same for the second find, for which I compensate here.

The author believes that, in terms of typology, this vessel is very close to the corresponding types of the Vučedol Culture. However, he does not clarify whether it is a pot or a deep bowl, and the illustration is not accompanied by a section of the vessel profile or a scale. In the organization of the decoration on its exterior surface two zones can be distinguished: the narrow upper zone with rows of opposing stamped triangles, and the wide lower surface, with densely grooved lines ordered in vertical sequences so that they form a herringbone motif. The author notices that the upper decoration can be viewed in the context of identical decorations of the Ljubljana Culture on the one hand and the Vučedol Culture on the other. He points out that the connection of this decoration with one of those two cultures seems impossible to resolve, because there is almost no difference in this type of motif in the two cultures. The impression that this is indeed impossible is enhanced by the presence of vessels decorated in the Ljubljana style in Lazaruša, but also of those with barbotine decorations, whose origins the author links with the Vučedol Culture. Nevertheless, the author thinks that the upper decoration zone should be observed together with its typological features, which means that it should be linked with the Vučedol Culture,

Mogući izvor donje ukrasne zone on vidi u, prema njegovoj procjeni, istim motivima i vrlo sličnoj tehnici u badenskoj i vučedolskoj kulturi. Prvenstveno zbog kronoloških razloga odbacuje mogućnost povezivanja s badenskom kulturom, pa mu ostaje samo vučedolska kultura. Paralele traži u jednom od geografski najbližih naselja vučedolske kulture – Debelom brdu u Sarajevu, ali izravnih podudarnosti, kako sam piše, ni tu nema. Na kraju pošteno ističe da se unatoč tome što mu se predloženo rješenje čini logičnim, ne smiju sasvim isključiti i drukčiji pristupi u skladu s mogućim novim nalazima.

Upravo ja imam drukčiji pristup pa time i rješenje problema, a za to nisu ni potrebni novi nalazi. Treba prvo istaknuti kako su cik-cak ukrasi na posudu vučedolske kulture s Debelog brda toliko jednostavni da samo izdaleka sliče onima u donjoj ukrasnoj zoni posude iz Lazaruše. Takve se sličnosti, ako se želi, mogu vidjeti u svakom cik-cak ukrasu u bilo kojoj kulturi koja ih ima, bez obzira na razdoblje. Tehnike ukrašavanja također su različite, jer je posude s Debelog brda ukrašeno urezivanjem oštrim predmetom, a donja ukrasna zona posude iz Lazaruše – kako sam autor piše – žlijebljenjem. Isto tako, i oblik posude iz Lazaruše, sudeći po nađenom ulomku, toliko je jednostavan i uobičajen da se paralele za njega mogu tražiti i naći i izvan vučedolske kulture. Autor je bio puno bliže rješenju problema kada je donju ukrasnu zonu posude iz Lazaruše povezo s Černavoda III. kulturom. Tom se povezivanju ne protivi prostorni položaj Černavoda III. kulture, jer je autor previdio nalazišta te kulture u zapadnoj Srbiji i jugoistočnoj Bosni, odakle su njezini nositelji ili utjecaji mogli lako doći u istočnu Hercegovinu, odnosno u Lazarušu (Garašanin 1987, 53; Govedarica 2001). Ali, ipak je neosporno da je Černavoda III. kultura starija od početka II. faze Lazaruše, pa time i od spomenute posude. Zbog toga se i rješenje problema mora tražiti u okviru Coțofeni kulture koja se razvila u donjem Podunavlju, odnosno u Rumunjskoj uz snažan utjecaj Černavoda III. kulture od koje je preuzela i dalje nje govala takav ukras i takvu tehniku ukrašavanja tijekom cijelog svojeg razvoja. Štoviše, takav ukras i takva tehnika ukrašavanja su jedno od najvažnijih obilježja Coțofeni kulture (Roman 1977, posebno crteži na T. 55,1-3,6,12, T. 56,2,8,11, T. 58,2, T. 89,2).

Nalaz iz Lazaruše prisjeća nas na jednu keramičku posudu, slično ukrašenu, ali drukčijeg oblika (askos) iz naselja kostolačke kulture na nalazištu Čotu u Popovićima kod Rače u Pomoravlju, koja nas upućuje na jedan od mogućih pravaca kojim je taj način ukrašavanja došao s područja Coțofeni kulture u Lazarušu (Andrejić 1978, T. CII,1; Nikolić 2000, T. VII,10). Dok se za posudu iz Čota može pretpostaviti da predstavlja uvoz, to za posudu iz Lazaruše nije moguće zbog gornje ukrasne zone, koja nas upućuje da je riječ o domaćem proizvodu. Budući da smo eliminirali vučedolsku kulturu kao izvor donje ukrasne zone posude iz Lazaruše, također nema više razloga da u toj kulturi tražimo porijeklo gornje. Dakle, nju treba vezati za ljubljanski ukrasni stil kao dio starosjedilačke komponente u tom pećinskom staništu. U prilog tome ide i činjenica da je u Lazaruši nađeno još nekoliko ulomaka posuda ukrašenih ljubljanskim stilom, a ni jedan koji bi se mogao vezati za vučedolsku kulturu.

because he does not consider it logical to link the typological features with one and the decorative features, that is one part of these, with the other culture. For the lower decoration zone the author writes that it is strongly reminiscent of the typical decorations of the Cernavoda III Culture – the size of the decoration field with respect to the available surface, the technique of execution and the composition of motifs are almost identical. He points out that any firmer connection of the finds from Lazaruša and the Cernavoda III Culture is hindered by problems of a chronological nature and the spatial position of that culture. He sees a possible source for the lower decoration zone in what he believes are identical motifs and a very similar technique in the Baden and Vučedol Culture. Primarily on account of chronological reasons he discards the possibility of a connection with the Baden Culture, so that all that is left is the Vučedol Culture. He looks for parallels in one of the geographically nearest settlements of the Vučedol Culture – Debelo Brdo in Sarajevo, but, as he himself puts it, no direct correspondence could be found there either. Finally, he is fair in stating that even though he finds the proposed solution logical, one cannot entirely exclude different approaches in accordance with possible new finds.

I myself have a different approach and therefore also a solution to the problem, and this does not even require new finds. One should first point out that the zigzag decoration on the vessels of the Vučedol Culture from Debelo Brdo are so simple that they are only vaguely similar to those in the lower decoration zone on the vessel from Lazaruša. Such similarities, if one wishes to, can be seen in each zigzag decoration in any culture that has them, irrespective of the period. The decorative techniques are likewise different, because the pottery from Debelo Brdo is decorated by incisions with a sharp instrument, while the lower decoration zone of the vessel from Lazaruša is decorated – in the author's own words – with grooving. Also the shape of the vessel from Lazaruša, judging by the found sherd, is so simple and common that its parallels can be looked for and found also outside the Vučedol Culture. The author was much closer to solving the problem when he linked the lower decoration zone of the vessel from Lazaruša with the Cernavoda III Culture. This link is not called into question by the spatial position of the Cernavoda III Culture, because the author has overlooked the sites of this culture in western Serbia and southeastern Bosnia, from where its bearers or influences could have easily reached eastern Herzegovina, that is Lazaruša (Garašanin 1987, 53; Govedarica 2000). However, it is beyond doubt that the Cernavoda III Culture is earlier than the beginning of the phase II of Lazaruša, and thus also than the mentioned vessel. This is why the solution to the problem ought to be looked for within the frame of the Coțofeni Culture, which developed in the lower Danube basin, i.e. in Romania, highly influenced by the Cernavoda III Culture, from which it received and continued to cultivate this decorating technique throughout its entire existence. Moreover, this kind of decoration and decorative technique are one of the most important features of the Coțofeni Culture (Roman 1977, particularly the drawings on Pl. 55,1-3,6,12, Pl. 56,2,8,11, Pl. 58,2, Pl. 89,2).

The find from Lazaruša reminds us of one ceramic vessel, similarly decorated, but of different shape (askos) from a settlement of the Kostolac Culture at the site of Čot in Popovići near Rača in the Morava basin, which points toward one of the possible directions through which this method of decoration arrived from the area of the Coțofeni Culture to Lazaruša (Andrejić

Doduše, autor vezuje za tu kulturu pojavu inkrustacije i barbotina na keramičkom posuđu, ali to nije prihvatljivo. Već sam u svojoj prethodnoj recenziji iznio razloge zašto inkrustacija na tom nalazištu nije vučedolskog porijekla, već ju treba vezati za istočnobalkansku i donjopodunavsku, inače dominantnu komponentu. Sada bih dodao da to vrijedi i za barbotinsku keramiku, jer ona je dobro zastupljena upravo u Coțofeni kulturi (Roman 1977, 34), za koju smo vezali donju ukrasnu zonu posude iz Lazaruše o kojoj smo upravo govorili. Takav zaključak, naravno, ne mora vrijediti za barbotinsku keramiku u drugim eneolitičkim naseljima u Hercegovini, a posebno ne za Veliku gradinu u Varvari kod Prozora (faza A-1), gdje je prisutna komponenta vučedolske kulture, a odsutni su kulturni elementi s područja istočnog Balkana i donjeg Podunavlja.

U prilog iznesenim zaključcima idu i ostali nalazi žlijebljene keramike koja je u Lazaruši najbrojnija komponenta, a razlikuje se od žlijebljene keramike na ostalim nalazištima na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu. Razlike su u organizaciji ukrasa koji se u Lazaruši najvećim dijelom sastoje od širokih pojaseva ispunjenih alternativno postavljenim i redovito šrafiranim trokutima, a pojasevi su ograničeni s jednim ili dva reda udubljenja koja mogu biti kombinirana i s urezanim linijom (str. 53-54). Upravo su takve kompozicije zastupljene u Coțofeni kulturi (Roman 1977, T. 69,11,22, T. 80,1, T. 95,6).

Autor ponavlja svoje mišljenje da se eneolitik na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu, pa tako i u Hercegovini, može podijeliti samo na dvije razvojne faze, od kojih starija pripada ranom eneolitu, a mlađa razvijenom eneolitu. Naglašava da "između te dvije faze nisu utvrđeni nikakvi međuslojevi, bilo sterilni bilo s nekim drugim materijalom koji bi se između njih interpolirao, a nije ga moguće naći ni u nekim izdvojenim i nestratificiranim nalazima" (str. 148). Takvom tvrdnjom on isključuje mogućnost podjele unutar jedne od tih dviju faza, ali također ostavlja nerazjašnjenim prijelaz iz ranog u razvijeni eneolitik, odnosno iz kasne hvarsko-lisičićke u jadransku kulturu (kako je taj horizont svojedobno nazvala Paola Korošec). Zbog toga se trebamo osvrnuti na stratigrafski položaj zdjela s okomitim plastičnim rebrima na trbuhu i nizom kratkih ureza na uskom ramenom pojasu. Iskopavanja u Ravlića pećini pokazala su da je to posuđe mlađe, a ne starije od kanelirane keramike kako je to svojedobno zastupao S. Dimitrijević u svojoj periodizaciji nakovanske kulture, utemeljenoj na stilskoj analizi, a ne na stratigrafskim podacima. B. Marijanović je to posuđe svrstao u III.a fazu Ravlića pećine, odnosno u razvijeni eneolitik, iako je uočio da se pojavljuje samo na početku te faze koja se nastavlja na prethodnu s kaneliranim posuđem (Marijanović 1980-81, 37). U sloju razvijenog eneolitika u Hateljskoj pećini, inače bogatom keramičkim nalazima, to posuđe uopće nije nađeno, ali tamo nije zastupljen ni sloj s kaneliranom keramikom. Nasuprot tome, u jednoslojnom nizinskom eneolitičkom naselju Lastvine u Bukoviću kod Benkovca, pećini Vlaškoj peći kod Senja i Markovoj spilji na otoku Hvaru zastupljena je kanelirana keramika, ali i posude s okomitim plastičnim rebrima i kratkim urezima, dok keramika koja obilježava razvijeni eneolitik sasvim nedo-

1978, Pl. CII,1; Nikolić 2000, Pl. VII,10). While in the case of the vessel from Čot one can assume import, this is not possible with the Lazaruša vessel because of the upper decoration zone, which indicates that it was produced locally. Considering that we eliminated the Vučedol Culture as the source of the lower decoration zone of the vessel from Lazaruša, there are likewise no reasons to look within that culture for the source of the upper one. Therefore, it should be linked to the Ljubljana decorative style as part of the indigenous component in that cave residence. Another fact that speaks in favour of that is that several more vessel sherds decorated in the Ljubljana style have been found, and not a single one that could be related to the Vučedol Culture. True, the author established a link between this culture and the presence of incrustation and barbotine on ceramic vessels, but this cannot be accepted. In my previous review I already stated the reasons why incrustation on this site cannot be of Vučedol origin, but should be connected with the eastern Balkans and the lower Danube basin component, which, incidentally, is the dominant one. I would now like to add that the same applies to barbotine ceramics, because it is well represented precisely in the Coțofeni Culture (Roman 1977, 34), with which we linked the lower decoration zone of the vessel from Lazaruša that we just discussed. This conclusion, naturally, need not apply to the barbotine ceramics in other Eneolithic settlements in Herzegovina, Velika Gradina in Varvara near Prozor in particular (phase A-1), where a component of the Vučedol Culture is present, while cultural elements from the area of the eastern Balkans and the lower Danube basin are missing.

The stated conclusions are corroborated by other finds of grooved ware, which is the most numerous component in Lazaruša, and which differs from the grooved ware on other sites on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland. The differences lie in the organization of decoration, which in Lazaruša mostly consists of wide belts filled with alternating and regularly hatched triangles, while the belts are bordered with one or two rows of depressions, which may also come in combination with an incised line (p. 53-54). Precisely such compositions are represented within the Coțofeni Culture (Roman 1977, Pl. 69,11,22, Pl. 80,1, Pl. 95,6).

The author repeats his opinion that the Eneolithic on the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland, and thus also in Herzegovina, can be divided into two developmental phases only, the older belonging to the Early Eneolithic and the younger to the Advanced Eneolithic. He stresses that "no intermediate layers were established between these two phases, either sterile or with other material that would interpolate between those, and it is likewise not possible to find it in some separate and unstratified finds" (p. 148). With this claim he excludes the possibility of any divisions within either of the two phases, but also leaves unexplained the transition from the Early to the developed Eneolithic, i.e. from the late Hvar-Lisičići Culture to the Adriatic Culture (as this horizon had at one time been named by Paola Korošec). This is why we have to take a look at the stratigraphic position of bowls with vertical plastic ribs on the belly and a series of short incisions on the narrow shoulder belt. The excavation in Ravlića Pećina showed that this pottery is younger and not older than the cannellured ware, as had once been claimed by S. Dimitrijević in his periodization of the Nakovana Culture, founded on a stylistic analysis rather than on stratigraphic data. B. Marijanović classified this pottery into the phase IIIa of Ravlića Pećina, i.e. into the Advanced Eneolithic,



staje (Dimitrijević 1970; Forenbaher 1987, 89-90; Batović 1989, 11-14). Situacija je još jasnija u Veloj spili iznad Vele Luke na otoku Korčuli, gdje je iznad sloja s kaneliranom keramikom, a ispod sloja sa žlijebljenom keramikom i keramikom ukrašenom ljubljanskim stilom, otkriven izražen i bogat sloj s posudama s okomitim plastičnim rebrima i kratkim urezima (Čečuk, Radić 2005, 223-244). Iz svega izloženog jasno je kako postoji horizont kojeg obilježava ukrašavanje nizovima okomitih ureza i okomitim plastičnim rebrima. Izdvajanje tog horizonta ne znači da treba pod svaku cijenu izdvajati posebnu fazu i mijenjati autorovu periodizaciju na rani i razvijeni eneolitik, ali dopušta da se jedna od te dvije faze podijeli na dva dijela. Ali koja? Pojava takvog ukrašavanja u naseljima u kojima se život nije produžio u razvijenom eneolitu i dojam da nizovi okomitih ureza samo oponašaju kanelure, pokazuju da taj horizont treba promatrati kao završnu hvarsko-lisičićku kulturu. S druge strane, porijeklo okomitih plastičnih rebra ne mora se nužno tražiti izvan područja istočne jadranske obale i njezinog zaleđa, barem ne u badenskoj kulturi. Autor je već prije upozorio da su identične posude s okomitim plastičnim rebrima nađene na Gradini u Alihodžama kod Travnika, gdje njihova pripadnost badenskoj kulturi, prema njegovoj ocjeni, ne bi trebala biti upitna. Čak je naglasio da zdjele tog tipa iz Ravlića pećine i Alihodža pokazuju potpunu usuglašenost i u tipološkom i u tehnološkom pogledu (Marijanović 1980-81, 50). U knjizi koju imamo pred sobom autor smatra, kada su u pitanju te posude, da u Alihodžama nije moguće ni pomišljati na bilo kakav "nakovanski" (tj. jadranski) utjecaj. Budući da on smatra da je badenska kultura u Bosni, pa tako i u Alihodžama, bila jedan od izvora ukrašavanja kaneliranjem u Hercegovini, odnosno na istočnoj jadranskoj obali, jasno je da u toj kulturi onda vidi i porijeklo ukrašavanja okomitim plastičnim rebrima. Takav zaključak dovodi u sumnju činjenica da su Alihodže jedino naselje badenske kulture u kojem su nađene tako ukrašene posude. Zbog toga je mnogo vjerojatnije da je posude ukrašene okomitim plastičnim rebrima i nizom kratkih ureza u Alihodže došlo iz neposrednog zaleđa istočne jadranske obale, a ne obratno. Nevjerojatno je da je tijekom eneolitika dolazilo do kulturnih strujanja samo iz unutrašnjosti ka istočnoj jadranskoj obali, a da nije bilo i obratno. To je još nevjerovatnije ako se ima u vidu izravno širenje neolitičkih jadranskih kultura u srednju Bosnu. Takav zaključak, uostalom, potvrđuje i kratkotrajno eneolitičko naselje na Podu kod Bugojna koje se kulturno može vezati samo za istočnu jadransku obalu (Čović 1991, 11-12), što je autor zanemario.

Peto poglavlje ili druga velika tematska cjelina odnosi se na Bosnu. Svoja izlaganja autor opet počinje prikazom neolitičkog supstrata. Na tom su se području prostirale tri kulture koje autor smatra kasnoneolitičkim: butmirska, vinčanska i sopotska.

Butmirska kultura je predstavnik kasnog neolitika u srednjoj Bosni, a prema autorovim spoznajama rasprostirala se na području sliva Bosne – od Sarajeva do Novog Šehera. Međutim, naselja butmirske kulture u Bočcu kod Banje Luke i Durutovcima kod Kotor-Varoši svjedoče da se ona na zapadu prostirala i na području uz srednji tok rijeke

even though he noticed that it appears only at the beginning of that phase, which continues from the previous one with the cannellured pottery (Marijanović 1980-81, 37). In the layer of the Advanced Eneolithic in Hateljska Pećina, rich in ceramic finds, this pottery was not found at all, but there is likewise no trace of the layer with cannellured ceramics. In contrast to this, in the single-layer lowland Eneolithic settlement of Lastvine in Buković near Benkovac, the Vlaška Peć cave near Senj and Markova Spilja on the island of Hvar, cannellured ware is present, but also vessels with vertical plastic ribs and short incisions, whereas ceramics marking the Advanced Eneolithic is entirely missing (Dimitrijević 1970; Forenbaher 1987, 89-90; Batović 1989, 11-14). The situation is even more clear in Vela Spila above Vela Luka on the island of Korčula, where above the layer with cannellured ware, and below the layer with grooved ware and ware decorated in the Ljubljana style, a prominent and rich layer with vessels with vertical plastic ribs and short incisions was discovered (Čečuk, Radić 2005, 223-244). All this makes it quite clear that there is a horizon characterised by decoration with a series of vertical incisions and vertical plastic ribs. The distinction of this horizon does not mean that one should, at any cost, distinguish a separate phase and change the author's periodization into the Early and Advanced Eneolithic, but it does allow us to divide one of the two phases into two parts. But which one? The appearance of such decoration in settlements where life did not continue into the Advanced Eneolithic and the impression that the sequences of vertical incisions only imitate cannellures, show that this horizon should be viewed as the final Hvar-Lisičići Culture. On the other hand, the origin of vertical plastic ribs need not necessarily be sought outside the area of the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland, at least not in the Baden Culture. The author had already earlier drawn attention to the fact that identical vessels with vertical plastic ribs were found at Gradina in Alihodže near Travnik, where their affiliation with the Baden Culture, in his opinion, should not come into doubt. He even stressed that vessels of that type from Ravlića Pećina and Alihodže show perfect accordance in both the typological and technological sense (Marijanović 1980-81, 50). In the book we have before us the author believes, when it comes to those vessels, that it is not possible to conceive of any "Nakovana" (i.e. Adriatic) influence. Given that he believes that the Baden Culture in Bosnia, and thus also in Alihodže, was one of the sources of cannellured decoration in Herzegovina, that is on the eastern Adriatic coast, it is clear that he also sees in that culture the origin of decoration with vertical plastic ribs. Such a conclusion is called in question by the fact that Alihodže are the only Baden Culture settlement in which vessels decorated in this manner were found. This makes it far more probable that the vessels decorated with vertical plastic ribs and a sequence of short incisions arrived in Alihodže from the immediate hinterland of the eastern Adriatic coast, instead of the other way round. It is not probable that during the Eneolithic the cultural currents led only from the interior towards the eastern Adriatic coast, and that nothing led in the opposite direction. This is all the more so if one takes into account the direct spread of the Neolithic Adriatic cultures into central Bosnia. This conclusion, after all, is corroborated by the short-lived Eneolithic settlement at Pod near Bugojno, which can culturally be linked only with the eastern Adriatic coast (Čović 1991, 11-12), which was neglected by the author.

The fifth chapter or the second large thematic unit is dedicated to Bosnia. The author again begins with a presentation of

Vrbasa i uz rijeku Vrbanju (Jamaković 1986a; Jamaković 1991). Kasna butmirska kultura, osim opće degeneracije, pokazuje različitu sliku na različitim dijelovima svojeg područja. Brojnost keramike hvarsko-lisičićke kulture u naseljima u Obrama II. kod Kaknja i Butmiru kod Sarajeva toliko je velika da njihovu pojavu nije moguće objasniti samo jednostavnim kulturnim utjecajima, nego se mora računati i sa značajnijim populacijskim prodorom. Autor konstatira sljedeće: *"Međutim, s iznimkom Obra II i Butmira, ni na jednom drugom nalazištu, bilo klasične bilo kasne faze butmirske kulture, nisu zabilježeni hvarsko-lisičićki nalazi, što jasno upućuje da se hvarsko-lisičićki prodor zaustavio na južnomu dijelu butmirskog područja. Na taj se način, završna faza butmirske kulture na jednom dijelu svoga područja iskazuje kao kulturna i populacijska mješavina degenerirane butmirske i znatno životnije hvarsko-lisičićke kulture, dok na drugomu dijelu svoga teritorija do kraja ostaje čista"* (str. 162). Dakle, njemu je kasna isto što i završna butmirska kultura, ali to ne može biti isto upravo zato što on izdvaja još jednu fazu mlađu od završetka III. faze neolitičkog naselja u Obrama II. On i tu ranoeneolitičku fazu naziva kasnom butmirskom kulturom, iako se upravo s njom završava ta kultura.

Sopotska kultura (koju autor naziva i sopotsko-lendelskom, iako je davno dokazano da sopotska kultura ne pripada lendelskom kulturnom krugu) u Bosni je zahvaćala samo uski pojas uz rijeku Savu.

Za vinčansku kulturu, koja je zahvaćala sjeveroistočnu Bosnu, autor ističe sljedeće: *"Napokon, ovdje treba podsjetiti i na sasvim određena dostignuća u preradi bakra po čemu se vinčanska kultura znatno izdvaja od ostalih neolitičkih kultura u Bosni i Hercegovini"* (str. 163). Ako se vinčanska kultura zbog toga znatno izdvaja od ostalih neolitičkih kultura, zašto onda autor nju ne gleda kao eneolitičku pojavu? Njegov pristup je projekcija danas sve rjeđe zastupljenog konzervativnog mišljenja da je vinčanska kultura isključivo neolitička pojava. U arheologiji su tijekom 20. st. paralelno postojala dva mišljenja: prvo, dugo dominantno, po kojem je vinčanska kultura u cjelini neolitička i drugo, po kojem je ona, ako ne od početka, onda barem u svojim mlađim fazama, eneolitička pojava. Već je dosta dugo jasno da mlađa vinčanska kultura nije imala samo "određena dostignuća", već vrlo razvijeno rudarstvo i metalurgiju bakra, čak neusporedivo razvijenije i intenzivnije od većine mlađih kultura na istom području, koje se smatraju neosporno eneolitičkima. O tome nam svjedoče rudnici bakra s rudarskim alatom i posuđem vinčanske kulture u njima, metalurške peći i metalurški pribor te bakrena ruda i troska u naseljima i danas već mnogobrojni primjerci bakrenog oruđa, oružja i nakita u naseljima i jednom groblju. Postoje indicije da su nositelji vinčanske kulture bili toliko spretni metalurzi da su čak proizvodili živu, a i olovo im je bilo poznato. Već je u vrijeme kada je autor obranio svoju disertaciju, Milutin Garašanin, glavni zastupnik teorije da je vinčanska kultura neolitička pojava, ispravio svoje mišljenje i prihvatio da je ona eneolitička pojava u svojim mlađim fazama (Garašanin 1991, 11-15). Naravno, to ne znači da je svako naselje imalo razvijenu metalurgiju i da kameno oruđe i oružje i dalje

the Neolithic substrate. Three cultures that the author considers as belonging to the Late Neolithic were distributed there: the Butmir, Vinča and Sopot cultures.

The Butmir Culture is a representative of the Late Neolithic in central Bosnia, and according to the author's understanding, it covered the basin of the Bosna River – from Sarajevo to Novi Šeher. However, the settlements of the Butmir Culture in Bočac near Banja Luka and Durutovci near Kotor-Varoš testify that in the west it also spread along the middle course of the Vrbas River and along the Vrbanja River (Jamaković 1986a; Jamaković 1991). The late Butmir Culture, in addition to the general degeneration, presents a different picture in different parts of its territory. The quantity of the ceramics of the Hvar-Lisičići Culture in the settlements of Obre II near Kakanj and Butmir near Sarajevo is so great that its appearance cannot be explained by simple cultural influences, but one must reckon with a considerable movement of population. The author states the following: *"However, with the exception of Obre II and Butmir, the finds of the Hvar-Lisičići Culture have not been documented on any other site of either the classical or the late phase of the Butmir Culture, which clearly demonstrates that the Hvar-Lisičići intrusion stopped in the southern part of the Butmir territory. In this way, the final phase of the Butmir Culture in one part of its territory displays a cultural and population mixture of the degenerated Butmir Culture and the far more lively Hvar-Lisičići Culture, while in the other part of its territory it remains pure until the end"* (p. 162). For him, therefore, the late Butmir Culture equals the final Butmir Culture, but this cannot be so precisely because he distinguishes another phase, later than the end of the phase III of the Neolithic settlement in Obre II. This Early Eneolithic phase he also calls the late Butmir Culture, even though it is precisely with this phase that this culture ends.

The Sopot Culture (which the author also calls the Sopot-Lengyel Culture, even though it was demonstrated long ago that the Sopot Culture does not form part of the Lengyel cultural circle) in Bosnia covered only a narrow belt along the Sava River.

Of the Vinča Culture, which occupied northwestern Bosnia, the author states the following: *"Finally, one should be reminded here of the quite specific achievements in the processing of copper, which considerably distinguishes the Vinča Culture from the remaining Neolithic cultures in Bosnia and Herzegovina"* (p. 163). If this is the reason for a significant distinction of the Vinča Culture from the remaining Neolithic cultures, then why doesn't the author view this culture as an Eneolithic phenomenon? His approach is a reflection of the nowadays increasingly abandoned conservative opinion that the Vinča Culture is exclusively Neolithic phenomenon. In the course of the 20th century two parallel opinions existed in archaeology: the first, dominant for a long time, which viewed the younger Vinča Culture as an entirely Neolithic phenomenon, and the second, which considered it an Eneolithic phenomenon, at least in its later phases if not from the beginning. It has been clear for quite some time that the Vinča Culture did not have only "specific achievements", but also highly developed mining and metallurgy of copper, in fact much more developed and intensive than that of most later cultures in the same territory, which are considered indisputably Eneolithic. Testimony to that are the copper mines with mining tools and vessels of the Vinča Culture found in those, metallurgical kilns and metallurgical equipment, copper ore and slag in the settlements, and the already quite numerous specimens of copper tools, weapons and jewellery found in the settlements and on one cemetery.

nije bilo u masovnoj upotrebi, ali mlađu vinčansku kulturu u suštini treba promatrati kao eneolitičku pojavu.

Iako je u Bosni do sada poznato više od 30 eneolitičkih nalazišta, autor svoja razmatranja i zaključke zasniva na svega 9, koja mu se čine ključna za rješavanje početka, razvoja i trajanja eneolitika na tom području. Međutim, pri rekonstrukciji općih razvojnih procesa i rasprostranjenosti pojedinih kultura na tom području, on uključuje i ostala njemu poznata nalazišta. Pa i od izdvojenih 9 nalazišta najviše je prostora posvetio Biogradu u Pruscu kod Gornjeg Vakufa, Gradini u Alihodžama i Crkvini u Turbetu, oboje kod Travnika. Od ta tri nalazišta najveću je pozornost i povjerenje dao rezultatima svojeg arheološkog iskopavanja na Biogradu. Na jednom mjestu piše da je iskopavanje Z. Žeravice na tom nalazištu bilo prvenstveno usmjereno na srednjovjekovne slojeve i da rezultati nisu objavljeni, dok je njegovo iskopavanje bilo usmjereno na prehistorijske slojeve. Rezultati iskopavanja Z. Žeravice ipak su objavljeni u obliku kratkog izvještaja i to s planom nalazišta s ucrtanim sondama (Odavić 1986, 77, T. XXXV,1), dok za Marijanovićevu sondu, čiji profil on objavljuje, to nedostaje, već samo iz opisa u jednom njegovom radu doznajemo gdje je otprilike bila otvorena (Marijanović 2001, 91).

Autor je na osnovi analize sadržaja kulturnih slojeva u Biogradu, Alihodžama i Crkvinama uvjerljivo dokazao da istodobno s badenskom i lasinjskom kulturom, koje su u Bosnu dospjele migracijama, još uvijek živi starosjedilačka butmirska kultura. Njegova izlaganja o toj temi uglavnom su usklađena s jednim njegovim ranije objavljenim radom (Marijanović 1989). Butmirska kultura na sva tri naselja prepoznatljiva je isključivo po tehnološkim i smanjenim tipološkim obilježjima, dok potpuno nedostaju njezini prepoznatljivi ukrasi. Promjene su vidljive i u tipu naselja, jer sva tri naselja imaju gradinski položaj, za razliku od neolitičkih koja su smještena u nizini. Također je na sva tri naselja potvrđena istodobnost butmirske i badenske kulture. Butmirska kultura u Biogradu i na Crkvinama određuje karakter naselja u cjelini, dok su elementi badenske kulture zastupljeni u obliku koji isključuje prisutnost njezinih nositelja. To isto vrijedi za skromne elemente lasinjske kulture i one koje je autor odredio kao tisapolgarske, iako je iz kronoloških razloga vjerojatnije da je riječ o elementima bodrogkeresturske kulture. U Alihodžama je taj odnos obrnut i tu se elementi butmirske kulture pojavljuju u skromnom opsegu u okviru naselja badenske kulture te se može računati na određeni oblik suživota između dvije različite populacije, odnosno na asimilaciju nositelja butmirske kulture. Tu je fazu butmirske kulture autor datirao u rani eneolitik, s čim se moramo složiti. Jedino nije prihvatljivo nazivati tu fazu kasnom butmirskom kulturom, budući da je tako već definirani horizont te kulture koji odgovara III. fazi u neolitičkom naselju u Obrama II. Zbog toga je jedini prikladan naziv završna butmirska kultura. U suprotnom može lako doći do nejasnoća ili nesporazuma.

Autor ističe da su, osim nekih radova A. Benca, odsutne rasprave koje se odnose na neposredni prijelaz iz neolitika u eneolitik ili rasprave o odnosu starosjedilačkog supstrata i prvih "pouzdana" eneolitičkih kultura koje u Bosnu prodi-

There are indications that the bearers of the Vinča Culture were so skilled in metallurgy that they even produced mercury, and they were also familiar with lead. Already at the time when the author defended his dissertation, Milutin Garašanin, the major proponent of the theory that the Vinča Culture was a Neolithic phenomenon, corrected his opinion and accepted that it was an Eneolithic phenomenon in its later phases (Garašanin 1991, 11-15). Of course, this does not mean that every settlement had a developed metallurgy and that stone tools and weapons were not in massive use, basically the younger Vinča Culture should be viewed as an Eneolithic phenomenon.

Although there are currently more than 30 known Eneolithic sites in Bosnia, the author bases his observations and conclusions on only 9 that he considers of key importance for solving the beginning, development and duration of the Eneolithic in that area. However, in his reconstruction of the general developmental processes and distribution of individual cultures in the area, he also includes other sites known to him. Of the 9 chosen sites he has given the most space to Biograd in Prusac near Gornji Vakuf, Gradina in Alihodže and Crkvina in Turbe, both near Travnik. Of those three sites, most of his attention and confidence is reserved for the results of his archaeological excavations in Biograd. In one place he writes that Z. Žeravica's excavation at that site was primarily directed at the medieval layers and that the results were not published, whereas his excavation was directed at the prehistoric layers. The results of Z. Žeravica's excavation are nevertheless published in the form of a short report, including a site plan with drawn-in trenches (Odavić 1986, 77, Pl. XXXV,1), whereas in the case of Marijanović's trench, whose section he publishes, this is lacking, and it is only from a description in one of his papers that we can learn the approximate position where the trench was opened (Marijanović 2001, 91).

Based on the analysis of the contents of the cultural layers in Biograd, Alihodže and Crkvine, the author convincingly proves that the indigenous Butmir Culture continues to exist alongside the Baden and the Lasinja cultures, which arrived in Bosnia through migrations. His presentations on that topic are mostly in accord with one of his previously published papers (Marijanović 1989). The Butmir Culture at all three settlements is recognizable exclusively by the technological and diminished typological features, whereas its recognizable decorations are entirely missing. Changes are visible also in the type of settlement, as all three settlements have a hillfort position, in contrast to the Neolithic ones, which are positioned in the lowland. Also, the contemporaneity of the Butmir and the Baden Culture is confirmed on all three sites. The Butmir Culture in Biograd and at Crkvine defines the entire character of the settlement, while elements of the Baden Culture are present in the form that excludes the presence of its bearers. The same applies to the modest elements of the Lasinja Culture and those attributed by the author to the Tiszapolgár Culture, even though chronological reasons make it more probable that these elements in fact belong to the Bodrogkeresztúr Culture. In Alihodže the relation is reversed and elements of the Butmir Culture appear in modest scope within the frame of the Baden Culture settlement, so that here we may reckon with a certain type of coexistence of two different populations or the assimilation of the bearers of the Butmir Culture. The author dated this phase of the Butmir Culture in the Early Eneolithic, which we must accept. The only unacceptable thing is to call that phase the late Butmir Culture, because this term was already used to de-

ru iz drugih područja. U eneolitičkom horizontu, koji autor izdvađa kao stariji, u određenoj su mjeri prisutne samo dvije izrazito eneolitičke kulture: lasinjska i badenska. On smatra kako je prisutnost tih kultura kao samostalnih pojava u Bosni vrlo ograničena. Autor poznaje tri naselja lasinjske kulture: Zemunicu u Radosavskoj, Visoko brdo u Lupljanici i Vis u Modranu, oboje kod Dervente. Mogao bi joj pripadati jedan horizont u Gornjem Klakaru, ali to nije sasvim pouzdano. Ipak, broj naselja lasinjske kulture u Bosni je veći. Popisu možemo dodati Bijelića glavicu u Drugovićima i Cazin (Jamaković 1986; Raunig 2001, 122-127). Od naselja badenske kulture poznaje četiri: Gradinu u Alihodžama, Kastel u Banjoj Luci, Vinogradine u Ševarlijama kod Doboja i Dvorove kod Bijeljine. Broj naselja badenske kulture također je veći: Njive u Golom brdu i Veliki gradac u okolini Ostojićeva, oboje kod Bijeljine (Kosorić 1978; Kosorić 1982, 126-127). Također, u svojim je razmatranjima previdio rezultate iskopavanja na Brdu u Dvorovima (Kosorić 1965).

Autor zaključuje sljedeće: *"Ostaje na kraju još samo pitanje teritorijalnog odnosa dviju starijih eneolitskih kultura koje su prodrle u južnu Bosnu. A. Benac je, na temelju kartiranja njihovih nalazišta, zaključio da su one u osnovnim linijama zauzele usporedne prostore u sjevernoj Bosni: lasinjska zapadni a badenska istočni dio. Tomu se zaključku nema što prigovoriti. Čak ni otkriće badenskoga naselja u Kastelu ga ne osporava. Jedino bi se, možda, mogla ostaviti mogućnost da u graničnom pojasu, koji čini rijeka Bosna, postoji stanovito odstupanje od tako idealno zamišljene granice. No, ta mogućnost i nema neku posebnu važnost"* (str. 204). Naprotiv, naselje badenske kulture na Kastelu i te kako ima posebnu važnost jer se nalazi na rijeci Vrbasi, a to je vrlo daleko na zapadu da bi bilo samo odstupanje od pretpostavljene granice koju bi činila rijeka Bosna. Danas, poslije otkrića velikog metalurškog centra badenske kulture u Donjoj Vrbi kod Slavanskog Broda (uz već poznato u obližnjoj Gornjoj Bebrini), nema više sumnje da je ta kultura imala vrlo razvijenu metalurgiju bakra, pa samim time nije prihvatljiv autorov zaključak da je vučedolska kultura pokretač i nositelj metalurgije bakra u Bosni, preciznije na području južno od rijeke Save (str. 234). Nedavno je Aleksandar Durman iscrpno obradio metalurgiju badenske kulture s posebnim osvrtom na Donju Vrbu i Gornju Bebrinu. Njegovo kartiranje nalazišta badenske kulture u Slavoniji i Srijemu pokazalo je da su ona smještena uz trasu starog puta koji spaja Vukovar sa Slavanskim Brodom, i da su preko rijeke Save nositelji te kulture odlazili u Bosnu u potrazi za rudnim ležištima (Durman 2000, 99-100). Šteta je samo to što je A. Durman previdio naselje badenske kulture na Kastelu, iako je objavljeno u arheološkoj literaturi (Žeravica 1983). Osim geografskog položaja Kastela, njegovoj postavci idu u prilog i nalazi iz sloja badenske kulture koji, nažalost, još nisu objavljeni. To su jedna keramička posuda za topljenje bakrene rude (čak s tragovima troske u unutrašnjosti) i jedan keramički kalup za izlivanje plosnatih pravokutnih sjekira, kakvi su nađeni u Donjoj Vrbi. Sva nalazišta badenske kulture u Bosni smještena su uz riječne komunikacije koje iz Posavine vode u unutrašnjost zapadnog Balkana do bogatih

fine a horizon of that culture corresponding to the phase III in the Neolithic settlement in Obre II. Therefore, the only appropriate term is the final Butmir Culture. Anything else may easily lead to vagueness or misunderstandings.

The author writes that, with the exception of certain papers by A. Benac, there are no discussions relating to the immediate transition from the Neolithic to the Eneolithic or discussions on the indigenous substrate and the first "definitely" Eneolithic cultures that penetrate into Bosnia from other areas. In the Eneolithic horizon, which the author distinguishes as the older one, only two explicitly Eneolithic cultures are present to a certain degree: the Lasinja and the Baden Culture. He believes that the presence of those cultures as independent phenomena in Bosnia is very limited. The author is familiar with three settlements of the Lasinja Culture: Zemunica in Radosavska, Visoko Brdo in Lupljanica and Vis in Modran, both near Derventa. One horizon in Gornji Klakar might also belong to this culture, but this is not entirely certain. Nevertheless, the number of settlements of the Lasinja Culture in Bosnia is bigger. We can expand the list with Bijelića Glavica in Drugovići and Cazin (Jamaković 1986; Raunig 2001, 122-127). The author is familiar with four settlements of the Baden Culture: Gradina in Alihodže, Kastel in Banja Luka, Vinogradine in Ševarlije near Doboj and Dvorovi near Bijeljina. The number of the Baden Culture settlements is also bigger: Njive in Golo Brdo and Veliki Gradac in the vicinity of Ostojićevo, both near Bijeljina (Kosorić 1978; Kosorić 1982, 126-127). Also, in his considerations he overlooked the results of the excavation at Brdo in Dvorovi (Kosorić 1965).

The author concludes the following: *"And finally, we are left with the question of the territorial relation of two earlier Eneolithic cultures that penetrated into southern Bosnia. A. Benac concluded, based on the mapping of their sites, that they basically occupied parallel territories in northern Bosnia: the Lasinja Culture took the western and the Baden Culture the eastern part. There are no objections to this conclusion. It is not called into question even by the discovery of the Baden settlement in Kastel. Perhaps one should only leave a possibility that in the border belt, formed by the Bosna River, there is a certain aberration of such an ideally conceived border. However, this possibility is not so very important"* (p. 204). On the contrary, the settlement of the Baden Culture at Kastel is indeed particularly important because it is located on the Vrbas River, which is too far in the west to represent a mere aberration from the presumed border formed by the Bosna River. Nowadays, after the discovery of a large metallurgical centre of the Baden Culture in Donja Vrba near Slavonki Brod (in addition to the previously known one in the nearby Gornja Bebrina), there is no more doubt that this culture had a highly developed metallurgy of copper, which therefore means that we cannot accept the author's conclusion that the Vučedol Culture was the originator and agent of copper metallurgy in Bosnia, or more precisely in the territory south of the Sava River (p. 234). Aleksandar Durman has recently analyzed in detail the metallurgy of the Baden Culture with particular emphasis on Donja Vrba and Gornja Bebrina. His mapping of the Baden Culture sites in Slavonia and Srijem showed that these are positioned along the direction of the old route connecting Vukovar with Slavonki Brod, and that the bearers of that Culture went to Bosnia across the Sava River in search of ore sources (Durman 2000, 99-100). It is a pity only that A. Durman overlooked the Baden Culture settlement at Kastel, although it was published in the archaeological literature (Žeravica 1983). In addition to the geographic position of Kastel, his hypothesis is also

ležišta bakra i arsena (koji su nositelji badenske kulture davali kao primjesu bakru, poboljšavajući time kvalitetu izli-venih predmeta). Tako su Kastel i novootkriveno nalazište u Aginom Selu smješteni na Vrbasu, Vinogradine na Bosni, a Dvorovi, Golo Brdo i Ostojićevo uz donji tok Drine. Alihodže su smještene na rijeci Biloj (pritoka Bosne) koja je s rijekom Vrbanjom (pritoka Vrbasa) važna komunikacija što povezuje rijeke Vrbas i Bosnu. Dakle, nositelji badenske kulture nisu podijelili s nositeljima lasinjske područje južno od Save, već su se naselili uz glavne riječne komunikacije prema rudnim ležištima. Na taj su način nositelji badenske i lasinjske kulture mogli živjeti jedni pored drugih na istom području.

Mlađi relativnokronološki odsjek eneolitika u Bosni definiraju, prema autorovom mišljenju, kostolačka i vučedolska kultura koje su nositelji cjelokupnog razvoja na tom području. Autor naglašava da je uloga kostolačke kulture razmjerno ograničenog opsega, jer je i njezina rasprostranjenost u Bosni dosta ograničena. Svoja razmatranja o karakteru i ulozi kostolačke kulture autor sažeto iznosi u sljedećim rečenicama:

*"Ovdje je zanimljiv još podatak da kostolačka naselja u Bosni pripadaju onoj skupini njezinih nalazišta na kojima se ona očituje u svomu čistomu obliku, što je poslužilo kao argument u pretpostavci da se i proces njezina nastajanja veže upravo za ta nalazišta rasprostranjena u slavonsko-srijemskom području i područjima južno od Save. Prema toj pretpostavci proizlazilo bi da i bosanski lokaliteti, Pivnica prije svega, pripadaju primarnim središtima njezina nastajanja. Treba, međutim, odmah reći da se kostolačka kultura i na Pivnici, a i ostalim ovdje navedenim nalazištima, očituje u svomu već definiranu obliku koji ne ostavlja mogućnost uočavanja bilo kakve postupnosti u razvoju. Osim toga, treba imati na umu i činjenicu da se badenska kultura, koja se uzima kao odlučujući čimbenik u tvorbi kostolačke kulture, na bosanskom prostoru ne očituje u opsegu koji bi pružao osnovu za ovakvo promatranje. Takvo mišljenje je u literaturi već iznijeto.*

*Kostolačka je kultura, kako je već prethodno istaknuto, ograničena na veoma mali broj nalazišta, među kojima se samo dva - Pivnica i Vis-Modran - očituju kao prava naselja s očiglednim trajnim karakterom. U Donjoj Mahali je to samo mogućnost, a na ostalim lokalitetima to su samo slabiji tragovi. Zanimljivo je ovdje naglasiti da su upravo ta tri naselja locirana na krajnjoj sjevernoj periferiji bosanskoga područja, što dopušta konstataciju da su i nositelji kostolačke kulture praktički samo prešli preko rijeke Save ne upuštajući se u bilo kakvo ozbiljnije širenje u središnje i južne dijelove Bosne. Prisutnost kostolačkoga materijala na pojedinim mjestima oko gornjega toka rijeke Bosne ne protuslovi ovoj konstataciji, jer i njihov opseg, karakter, a i uloga u ukupnosti razvoja toga dijela Bosne nema dalekosežnijeg značenja" (str. 205).*

Ti zaključci uglavnom nisu prihvatljivi zbog dva razloga: Prvo, novija proučavanja kostolačke kulture pokazala su da ona nije nastala u jugoistočnom panonskom području i da badenska kultura nije imala odlučujuću ulogu u njezinom nastanku, već da je nastala na srednjem Balkanu, na supstratu Černavoda III. kulture uz elemente starijih kultu-

corroborated by the finds from the Baden Culture layer, which, unfortunately, have not been published yet. These consist in a ceramic vessel for melting copper ore (even containing traces of slag in the interior) and a ceramic mould for casting flat rectangular axes, such as were found in Donja Vrba. All the Baden Culture sites in Bosnia are positioned along river communications that lead from the Sava basin to the interior of the western Balkans to rich sources of copper and arsenic (added by the bearers of the Baden Culture to copper in order to enhance the quality of cast artefacts). Kastel and the newly discovered site in Agino Selo lie on the Vrbas River, Vinogradine on the Bosna, while Dvorovi, Golo Brdo and Ostojićevo lie along the lower course of the Drina. Alihodže lies on the Bila River (a tributary of the Bosna), an important communication that together with the Vrbanja River (a tributary of the Vrbas) connects the Vrbas and the Bosna Rivers. Therefore, the bearers of the Baden Culture did not share with the bearers of the Lasinja Culture the territory south of the Sava, but settled along the main River communications towards the sources of ore. This is how the bearers of the Baden and the Lasinja cultures were able to live alongside each other in the same area.

In terms of relative chronology, the later part of the Eneolithic in Bosnia is defined, in the author's opinion, by the Kostolac and Vučedol cultures, bearers of the overall development in that area. The author emphasizes that the role of the Kostolac Culture is of a relatively limited scope, because its distribution in Bosnia is likewise rather limited. The author's considerations about the character and role of the Kostolac Culture are summarized in the following sentences:

*"Another interesting detail here is that the Kostolac settlements in Bosnia belong to that group of its settlements where it appears in its pure form, which served as an argument in the assumption that the process of its emergence is likewise connected precisely with those sites distributed in Slavonia and Srijem and the territory south of the Sava. According to that assumption it would follow that the Bosnian sites, above all Pivnica, also belong to the primary centres of its emergence. However, we must say immediately that the Kostolac Culture at Pivnica as well as at the other sites mentioned here appears in its already defined form, which leaves no possibility to observe any gradation in its development. Besides, it should be kept in mind that the Baden Culture, considered a key factor in the creation of the Kostolac Culture, does not appear in the Bosnian territory in a scope that would create grounds for such consideration. This opinion has already been put forward in the literature.*

*The Kostolac Culture, as previously pointed out, is limited to a very small number of sites, only two of which – Pivnica and Vis-Modran – have the form of real settlements with an obviously permanent character. In Donja Mahala this was only a possibility, and at other sites there are only faint traces. It is interesting to mention here that precisely those three sites are located at the extreme north periphery of the Bosnian territory, which allows us to state that the bearers of the Kostolac Culture effectively just crossed the Sava River, without spreading seriously into the central and southern parts of Bosnia. The presence of the Kostolac material in certain places around the upper course of the Bosna River does not speak against this statement, because their scope, character and role in the overall development of that part of Bosnia has no far-reaching significance" (p. 205).*

These conclusions are mostly not acceptable for two reasons: First, recent research on the Kostolac Culture showed that it was not

ra – vinčanske i Bujanj-Salčuța (Nikolić 2000, 60-63, 80-81). Drugo, autor je previdio gradinu Klisuru u Kadića brdu na kojoj se iznad sloja Černavoda III. kulture nalazi debeli sloj kostolačke kulture (Govedarica 1985, 21). To nalazište svjedoči da se kostolačka kultura u Bosni prostirala na mnogo većem području od onog što ga autor definira. To nalazište nas također upućuje da je jugoistočna Bosna mogla ulaziti u matično područje te kulture. Isto tako, to nalazište, kao i nalazišta sa sličnom stratigrafijom u Srbiji, upućuju nas da se ta kultura u sjevernu Bosnu nije proširila preko rijeke Save, već preko rijeke Drine i rijekom Bosnom od gornjeg toka nizvodno.

Najvažniju ulogu u eneolitiku Bosne imala je vučedolska kultura, o čemu nam svjedoči velik broj njezinih nalazišta. Ona je ujedno i najbolje istražena i definirana eneolitička kultura u Bosni. Autor upozorava na određene razlike koje on uočava kod nekih nalazišta te kulture, a koja se mogu svrstati u dvije skupine. Prva skupina nalazišta vezana je za srednju Bosnu i njoj pripadaju Alihodže, Biograd i Crkvine, dok je druga skupina vezana za zapadnu i južnu Bosnu i njoj pripadaju sva ostala nalazišta. Razlike između te dvije skupine nalazišta određene su stratigrafskim položajem te kulture. U prvoj skupini vučedolskoj kulturi pripadaju mlađi eneolitički slojevi i ona tu dolazi u kontekstu koji upućuje na izravne kontakte sa starijim skupinama stanovništva, dok je u drugoj skupini ona najranija pojava. Autor ne objašnjava u koju onda skupinu, prema njegovoj podjeli, spadaju Kastel i Zemunica koji su smješteni u sjeverozapadnoj Bosni i na kojima vučedolska dolazi poslije badenske, odnosno lasinjske kulture. Također, njegovom popisu naselja vučedolske kulture u Bosni možemo još dodati Crkvinu u Podastinju kod Kiseljaka, Cazin, Agino Selo kod Banje Luke i Pećinu pod lipom kod Sokolca (Imamović 1996, 65-67; Kujundžić-Vejzagić 2001, 40; Raunig 2001, 127-128).

Vučedolska kultura u pećini Hrustovači nije najranija pojava, kako to tvrdi autor. Na površini koja je zahvaćena iskopavanjem A. Benca, ispod sloja vučedolske kulture otkriven je tanki kulturni sloj koji je sadržavao samo garež od vatrišta i životinjske kosti kao ostatke prehrane ljudi (Benac 1948, 8-9). Međutim, na površini koja je zahvaćena ranijim iskopavanjem, ali na kojoj su slojevi bili poremećeni ili stratigrafija nije bila pouzdana, nađeno je nekoliko posuda koje su nesumnjivo starije od vučedolske kulture, a koje se mogu vezati za stariji sloj (Korošec 1946, T. XV, 1, 6-9, 12-13). Kulturna pripadnost tih nalaza, odnosno tog sloja nije sasvim jasna. Posuda na visokoj zvonolikoj šupljoj nozi s dijametralno postavljenim ovalnim otvorima svojstvena je sopotskoj kulturi, a i bikonične posude, kakvih je nađeno nekoliko, zastupljene su u toj kulturi. S druge strane, ukrasi svojstveni sopotskoj kulturi potpuno nedostaju, ali su na jednoj posudi zastupljene kanelure koje možda upućuju na utjecaj badenske kulture. Situacija na tom nalazištu nas upućuje na završetak sopotske kulture sličan butmirskoj. Smetnje u rješavanju tog problema su nedostatak nalazišta sopotske kulture u zapadnoj Bosni i nejasna sudbina njezinih nositelja u razdoblju koje odgovara pojavi lasinjske i badenske kulture na području koje je pouzdano pripadalo sopotskoj.

formed in the southeast Pannonian area and that the Baden Culture did not play a key role in its emergence, but that it came into being in the central Balkans, on the substrate of the Černavoda III Culture with elements of earlier cultures – the Vinča and the Bujanj-Salčuța Culture (Nikolić 2000, 60-63, 80-81). Second, the author overlooked the Klisura hillfort in Kadića Brdo, where above the layer of the Černavoda III Culture lies a thick layer of the Kostolac Culture (Govedarica 1985, 21). This site testifies that the Kostolac Culture in Bosnia was spread out over a far larger territory than that defined by the author. This site also indicates to us that southeastern Bosnia might have been part of the core territory of that culture. In the same way, this site, like the sites with a similar stratigraphy in Serbia, leads us to conclude that this culture did not spread into northern Bosnia across the Sava River, but across the Drina River and downstream along the upper course of the Bosna River.

The Vučedol Culture played the most important role in the Eneolithic of Bosnia, as testified by a large number of its sites. It is at the same time the most thoroughly researched and defined Eneolithic culture in Bosnia. The author draws attention to certain differences that he observed on some of the sites of that culture, which can be classified into two groups. The first group of sites is connected with central Bosnia and it comprises Alihodže, Biograd and Crkvine, while the second is connected with western and southern Bosnia, and it comprises all the remaining sites. The differences between these two groups of sites are determined by the stratigraphic position of this culture. In the first group, to the Vučedol Culture belong younger Eneolithic layers and it appears here in a context which indicates direct contacts with older groups of inhabitants, whereas in the second group it is the earliest phenomenon. The author does not explain to which group, in his classification, belong Kastel and Zemunica, which are situated in northwestern Bosnia and at which the Vučedol Culture comes after the Baden and the Lasinja Culture. Likewise, to his list of the Vučedol Culture settlements in Bosnia we can add Crkvina in Podastinje near Kiseljak, Cazin, Agino Selo near Banja Luka and Pećina Pod Lipom near Sokolac (Imamović 1996, 65-67; Kujundžić-Vejzagić 2001, 40; Raunig 2001, 127-128).

In the Hrustovača cave the Vučedol Culture is not the earliest phenomenon, as the author claims. On the surface covered by A. Benac's excavation, beneath the layer of the Vučedol Culture a thin cultural layer was discovered that contained only charcoal from a fireplace and animal bones as the remains of human meals (Benac 1948, 8-9). However, on the surface covered by earlier excavation, but on which the layers were disordered or the stratigraphy was unreliable, several vessels were found that were undeniably earlier than the Vučedol Culture, and which can be connected with the earlier layer (Korošec, 1946, Pl. XV, 1, 6-9, 12-13). The cultural attribution of those finds, i.e. of that layer is not entirely clear. A vessel on a high bell-shaped hollow leg with diametrically positioned oval openings is characteristic of the Sopot Culture, and biconical vessels, several of which were found, are present within that culture. On the other hand, decorations characteristic for the Sopot Culture are entirely missing, but one vessel contains canelures, which might suggest the influence of the Baden Culture. The situation on that site indicates that the Sopot Culture ended in a manner similar to the Butmir Culture. The resolution of this problem is hindered by the lack of Sopot Culture sites in western Bosnia and the unclear destiny of their bearers in the period corresponding to the appearance of the Lasinja and Baden cultures in the area that undeniably belonged to the Sopot Culture.

Autor smatra da je periodizacija eneolitika u Bosni u nekim segmentima još složenija od periodizacije u Hercegovini, jer je izravno vezana s periodizacijom eneolitika u cjelini, budući da većina kulturnoetničkih pojava koje se pri razmatranju tog pitanja moraju uzeti u obzir, ima znatno šire prostorno i kulturnopovijesno značenje nego u Hercegovini. On prihvaća i slijedi mišljenje A. Benca o posebnostima u razvoju eneolitičkih kultura u Bosni – a to su lasinjska, badenska, kostolačka i vučedolska – u odnosu na sva područja njihove rasprostranjenosti. U periodizaciji eneolitika u Bosni moraju se uvažavati posebnosti lokalnog značenja uvjetovane dinamikom širenja pojedinih spomenutih kultura, opsegom i značenjem njihove prisutnosti na tom području, odnosom prema starosjedilačkom supstratu, općim stanjem tog supstrata u doba obilježeno prisutnošću prvih, prema autoru izrazito eneolitičkih kultura i sl. U nastavku teksta autor pojašnjava razloge zbog kojih eneolitik u Bosni promatra kroz dvije razvojne faze: stariju i mlađu. Svoj pristup zasniva na izravnim i neizravnim podacima dobivenim usporedbom stratigrafije na sljedećim nalazištima: Visu, na kojem se iznad sloja lasinjske nalazi sloj kostolačke kulture u kojem su nađene i dvije vučedolske posude; Zemunici, gdje lasinjsku preslojava vučedolska kultura; Kastelu, gdje vučedolska kultura dolazi poslije badenske, Alihodžama, gdje se iznad sloja badenske kulture s elementima butmirske nalazi sloj vučedolske kulture u kojem je nađen ulomak posude kostolačke kulture; Biogradu i Crkvinama, na kojima završnu fazu butmirske kulture s elementima badenske preslojava vučedolska. Na temelju tih podataka autor zaključuje da su završna butmirska te lasinjska i badenska kultura istodobne i starije od kostolačke i vučedolske kulture, koje su s druge strane približno istodobne.

Autorov zaključak da su kostolačka i vučedolska kultura u Bosni istodobne treba uzeti s oprezom i krajnjom rezervom. Već činjenica da je kostolačka kultura nastala na supstratu Černavoda III. kulture i da je njihov odnos stratigrafski potvrđen na gradini Klisuri u Kadića brdu, upućuje nas kako je pojava kostolačke kulture u Bosni starija od pojave vučedolske, odnosno da je kostolačka jednim dijelom istodobna s badenskom. Djelomična istodobnost badenske i kostolačke kulture već je bila potvrđena na nekoliko naselja izvan Bosne. Tu je dalje i problem odnosa vučedolske kulture prema ranobrončanodobnim kulturama. Autor piše da se datiranje te kulture u rano brončano doba ne može više prihvatiti, barem ne onako kako su to predložili S. Dimitrijević i Nikola Tasić. Međutim, očito je pobrkao osobe, jer to mišljenje nije zastupao S. Dimitrijević, već su ga, osim N. Tasića, zastupali još Dragoslav Srejšević i B. Čović. Njih su trojica to mišljenje svojedobno zastupali zbog toga što ranobrončanodobne kulture na zapadnom Balkanu i u južnoj Panoniji tada nisu bile poznate ili definirane, a trebalo je popuniti kronološku prazninu. Čim su bile otkrivene i definirane ranobrončanodobne kulture koje su smijenile vučedolsku, oni su napustili to mišljenje. Riječ je o vinkovačkoj kulturi u Slavoniji i kulturama privremeno nazvanima po fazama višelojnih naselja kao Pod A i Varvara A-2. Njima srodne susjedne kulture na srednjem

The author believes that the periodization of the Eneolithic in Bosnia is in certain segments even more complex than the periodization in Herzegovina, because it is directly connected to the periodization of the Eneolithic as a whole, as most cultural and ethnic phenomena that have to be taken into consideration in the analysis of the issue have a considerably wider spatial and cultural-historical significance than in Herzegovina. He accepts and follows A. Benac's opinion regarding the particularities in the development of the Eneolithic cultures in Bosnia – and these are: the Lasinja, Baden, Kostolac and Vučedol cultures – in relation to all the areas of their distribution. The periodization of the Eneolithic in Bosnia must take into account the idiosyncrasies of local significance that have been conditioned by the dynamics of the spreading of certain among the mentioned cultures, the scope and significance of their presence in the area, the relation to the indigenous substrate, the general situation of that substrate in the time marked by the presence of the first, in the author's opinion explicitly Eneolithic cultures, and so on. The text goes on to clarify the reasons why the author views the Eneolithic in Bosnia through two developmental phases: the older and the younger. He bases his approach on direct and indirect data obtained by comparing the stratigraphic situation on the following sites: Vis, where above the Lasinja Culture layer there is a layer of the Kostolac Culture, in which two Vučedol vessels were found; Zemunica, where the Lasinja Culture is overlaid by the Vučedol Culture; Kastel, where the Vučedol Culture comes after the Baden Culture; Alihodže, where above the Baden Culture layer with elements of the Butmir Culture there is a layer of the Vučedol Culture in which a sherd of a vessel of the Kostolac Culture was found; Biograd and Crkvine, where the final phase of the Butmir Culture with elements of the Baden Culture is overlaid by the Vučedol Culture. On the basis of those data the author concludes that the final Butmir Culture and the Lasinja and Baden cultures are synchronous and older than the Kostolac and Vučedol cultures, which, on the other hand, are approximately synchronous.

The author's conclusion that the Kostolac and Vučedol cultures in Bosnia are synchronous has to be taken with caution and extreme reserve. The fact that the Kostolac Culture was formed on the substrate of the Černavoda III Culture, and that their relationship was stratigraphically confirmed at the Klisura hillfort in Kadića Brdo, in itself already indicates that the appearance of the Kostolac Culture in Bosnia occurred older than the Vučedol Culture, and that the Kostolac Culture is partly synchronous with the Baden Culture. The partial contemporaneity of the Baden and the Kostolac Culture has already been confirmed on several sites outside Bosnia. There is further the problem of the relation of the Vučedol Culture with the Early Bronze Age cultures. The author states that the dating of that culture into the Early Bronze Age is no longer acceptable, at least not in the manner proposed by S. Dimitrijević and Nikola Tasić. However, he has obviously confused the persons in question, because this opinion was not advocated by S. Dimitrijević but, along with N. Tasić, by Dragoslav Srejšević and B. Čović. The three of them advocated this opinion at one time on account of the fact that the Early Bronze Age cultures in the western Balkans and in southern Pannonia were not known or defined then, and there was a chronological void to be filled. As soon as the Early Bronze Age cultures, that replaced the Vučedol Culture, were discovered and defined, they abandoned this opinion. These cultures are the Vinkovci Culture in Slavonia and the cultures temporarily named after the phases of

Balkanu i na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njezinom zaleđu su sljedeće: posuška, Belotić – Bela Crkva, Armenochori i Bujanj-Hum III. Te kulture pripadaju nositeljima grube keramike koji krajem 3. tisućljeća prije Krista donose nove oblike, ukrase i tehnologiju u izradi keramičkog posuđa, koji su sasvim drukčiji nego u kostolačkoj i vučedolskoj kulturi. Nositelji grube keramike masovno su se doseljavali iz donjeg Podunavlja i istočnog Balkana prema drugim dijelovima tog poluotoka. Oni nisu uništili zatečeno starosjedilačko stanovništvo, već su se pomiješali s njim i stvorili nove kulturne i etničke zajednice, nesumnjivo indoeuropske. Budući da su nositelji grube keramike bili brojnije, vitalnije i organizacijski nadmoćno stanovništvo, starosjedilačko stanovništvo imalo je izbor asimilacije ili povlačenja pred njima. Ti su se procesi počeli odvijati puno prije završetka vučedolske kulture. Tako u istočnoj Slavoniji već klasičnu vučedolsku kulturu smjenjuje vinkovačka (Dimitrijević 1982, 15-17). To nesumnjivo govori da je kasna vučedolska kultura u Bosni bila djelomično istodobna s vinkovačkom i njoj srodnim kulturama. Međutim, je li to bio slučaj i s kostolačkom kulturom? Njezin geografski položaj govori nam da se ona našla na udaru širenja nositelja grube keramike prije vučedolske kulture pa je opravdano očekivati i njezin raniji nestanak. Barem na matičnom području! Time nije isključena mogućnost da su se neke zajednice kostolačke kulture povukle prema zapadu i sjeverozapadu i naselile područja koja im do tada nisu pripadala. Možda o tome govore naselja kostolačke kulture u zapadnoj Slavoniji i sjeverozapadnoj Bosni: Slavči kod Nove Gradiške (Skelac 1997, 223) i Đurića brdu u Mašićima kod Bosanske Gradiške (ulomke keramičkog posuđa kostolačke kulture našao sam prilikom obilaska 2005.).

Nedavno je Zorko Marković analizirao sadržaj naselja kasne vučedolske kulture (faza V.) u Zecovima kod Prijedora i zaključio da je ono istodobno s vinkovačkom kulturom i da pripada početnoj fazi ranog brončanog doba (Marković 2002, 147-151). Međutim, činjenica da je kasna vučedolska kultura djelomično istodobna s vinkovačkom nije dovoljan razlog da ju zbog toga treba datirati u rano brončano doba. Kasna vučedolska kultura je još uvijek i stilski i metalurški (ljevaoničarski kalupi za odgovarajuće tipove bakrenih sjekira) eneolitička pojava (Čović 1976). To ne znači da su nositelji vinkovačke ili neke druge njoj srodne kulture bili oni koji su otkrili ili donijeli metalurgiju bronce u krajeve koje su naseljavali nositelji vučedolske i kostolačke kulture. Bez obzira kojeg je porijekla metalurgija bronce u jugoistočnoj Europi i kako je ona uvedena, nesporno je to da je snažni prijelom u kulturnom razvoju izazvan doseljavanjem nositelja grube keramike bio početak novog – brončanog doba.

U zaključku B. Marijanović ponovno upozorava kako je podudarnost periodizacije eneolitika Hercegovine na jednoj i Bosne na drugoj strani (podjela na rani i razvijeni eneolitik) samo formalna sličnost, a da se stvarni karakter razvojnih procesa na ta dva područja u dobroj mjeri razlikuje. Razvojni procesi u Hercegovini prvenstveno su obilježeni preobrazbom starosjedilačkog supstrata uz djelovanje vanjskih

multi-layered settlements such as Pod A and Varvara A-2. Their neighbouring and related cultures in the central Balkans and on the eastern Adriatic coast and in its hinterland are as follows: the Posušje, Belotić – Bela Crkva, Armenochori and Bujanj-Hum III cultures. These cultures belong to the bearers of coarse ceramics that towards the end of the 3rd millennium B.C. bring new shapes, decorations and technology in the production of ceramic vessels, completely different from those in the Kostolac and the Vučedol cultures. The bearers of coarse ceramics massively immigrated from the lower Danube basin and the eastern Balkans towards the other parts of the peninsula. They did not destroy the indigenous population there, but mixed with it and created new cultural and ethnic communities, undeniably Indo-European. Given that the bearers of coarse ceramics were the more numerous, vital and in terms of organization superior population, the indigenous population was left to choose between assimilation and withdrawal. These processes started to unfold much earlier than the end of the Vučedol Culture. Thus in eastern Slavonia the already classical Vučedol Culture is replaced by the Vinkovci Culture (Dimitrijević 1982, 15-17). This undoubtedly tells us that the late Vučedol Culture in Bosnia was partly synchronous with the Vinkovci Culture and cultures related to it. However, was this also the case with the Kostolac Culture? Its geographic position tells us that it came under the impact of the spread of the bearers of coarse ceramics earlier than the Vučedol Culture, so we would have reason to expect its earlier disappearance as well. At least in its core territory! This does not exclude the possibility that some communities of the Kostolac Culture withdrew towards the west and northwest, settling areas that previously had not belonged to them. Perhaps this is the story told by the Kostolac Culture settlements in western Slavonia and northwestern Bosnia: Slavča near Nova Gradiška (Skelac 1997, 223) and Đurića Brdo in Mašići near Bosanska Gradiška (where I discovered sherds of the Kostolac Culture pottery in the course of the 2005 survey).

Zorko Marković recently analyzed the contents of the late Vučedol Culture settlement (phase V) in Zecovi near Prijedor and concluded that it was contemporary with the Vinkovci Culture and that it belongs to the incipient phase of the Early Bronze Age (Marković 2000, 147-151). However, the fact that the late Vučedol Culture is partly synchronous with the Vinkovci Culture is not reason enough to date it into the Early Bronze Age. The late Vučedol Culture still remains, both in terms of style and metallurgy (casting moulds for corresponding types of copper axes), an Eneolithic phenomenon (Čović 1976). This does not mean that the bearers of the Vinkovci or another culture related to it were the ones who discovered or brought the metallurgy of bronze into the lands inhabited by the bearers of the Vučedol and Kostolac cultures. Irrespective of the origin of the bronze metallurgy in southeastern Europe and the way it was introduced, the powerful turning point in cultural development brought about by the arrival of the bearers of coarse ceramics undeniably marked the beginning of a new period – the Bronze Age.

In his conclusion B. Marijanović again warns that the concordance in the periodization of the Eneolithic of Herzegovina on one hand and Bosnia on the other (the division into the Early and Advanced Eneolithic) is but a formal similarity, and that the real character of developmental processes in those two regions is different to a large degree. Developmental processes in Herzegovina are primarily characterized by the transformation of the indigenous substrate with the action of external factors, which led to



činitelja, što je dovelo do složene kulturne, a u određenoj mjeri i etničke strukture. Razvojni procesi u Bosni znatno su manje određeni starosjedilačkim supstratom, a u puno većoj mjeri sudjelovanjem vanjskih kulturnih i etničkih pojava. Takva je periodizacija za sjeveroistočnu Bosnu prihvatljiva samo pod uvjetom da se mlađa vinčanska kultura promatra isključivo kao neolitička pojava. Međutim, o njezinom nespornom eneolitičkom karakteru bilo je dovoljno riječi i u ovoj recenziji.

Na kraju bih iznio i nekoliko primjedbi na jezičnu i tehničku kvalitetu knjige. Tekst je lektoriran, odnosno jezično prerađen, po krutoj varijanti hrvatskog pravopisa, tako da su mnoge rečenice izgubile jednostavnost, odnosno udaljile se od svakodnevnog govornog hrvatskog jezika. Usto samo lektoriranje često nije ni bilo dosljedno, ili je lektor bio površan, što stvara ružan osjećaj tijekom čitanja. Iako su ilustracije u novoj Marijanovićevoj knjizi ispale bolje nego u prethodnoj, ni ovaj put to nije bilo na nekoj visokoj tehnološkoj ili stručnoj razini. Ilustracije su opet lošije od izvornika, što posebno vrijedi za one izvedene tzv. tehnikom zračnog kista. Uoči posljednjeg rata dio tih ilustracija savršeno je reproduciran u jednom njegovom radu, pa je neshvatljivo da se to u novoj knjizi nije moglo ponoviti. Primjedbe se mogu staviti i na prijelom teksta, jer su riječi u nekim retcima previše razvučene, a u nekim opet previše zbijene, što opet stvara ružan osjećaj tijekom čitanja. Barem poklonicima lijepe knjige.

Prava je šteta što Marijanovićeve disertacije nije objavljena neposredno nakon obrane, jer bi imala mnogo veći odjek nego danas i bila bi veliki poticaj za daljnje rasprave o eneolitiku. Sada, iako knjiga ima nespornu znanstvenu vrijednost, ona ukupno gledajući ipak predstavlja zastarjelo i u mnogočemu ponovljeno djelo.

a complex cultural, and to a certain degree, also ethnic structure. Developmental processes in Bosnia are far less determined by the indigenous substrate and far more by the action of external cultural and ethnic phenomena. Such a periodization in the case of northwestern Bosnia is acceptable only under the condition that the younger Vinča Culture is viewed exclusively as a Neolithic phenomenon. However, its undeniable Eneolithic character has been sufficiently discussed in this review as well.

Finally, I would like to comment on the linguistic and technical quality of the book. The language editing, that is revision, of the text was done according to a rigid variant of Croatian orthography, with the result that many sentences lost their simplicity and thus became far removed from everyday spoken Croatian. In addition to this, the editing itself was frequently not consistent, or the editor was superficial, which creates an unpleasant feeling during reading. Although the illustrations in Marijanović's new book came out better than in the previous one, once again the technological or professional level is by no means high. The illustrations are once again worse than the original, particularly those done in the so-called air brush technique. On the eve of the last war, a part of those illustrations were perfectly reproduced in one of his papers, so it is quite surprising that this could not have been done also in the new book. Objections can also be made also about the layout of the text, because the words in some lines are excessively extended, whereas in others they are too dense, which again leaves an unpleasant feeling during reading. At least to those who appreciate beautiful books.

It is indeed a pity that Marijanović's dissertation was not published immediately following its defence, because it would have had much greater repercussion than it has today and would have been a great impetus for further discussions about the Eneolithic. Today, even though the book has undeniable scientific value, all things considered it is nevertheless an obsolete and in many ways repeated work.

## LITERATURA/BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrejić Ž., 1978, Arheološko rekognosciranje Donje Lepenice, *ArhPregl* 20, Beograd, 164-171.
- Batović Š., 1989, Istraživanje prapovijesti sjeverne Dalmacije od 1984. do 1988. godine, *Diadora* 11, Zadar, 5-57.
- Benac A., 1948, Završna istraživanja u pećini Hrustovači, *GZMS III*, Sarajevo, 5-41.
- Benac A., 1957, Zelena pećina, *GZMS Arh XII*, Sarajevo, 61-92.
- Benac A., 1991, Das frühe Äneolithikum im ostadriatischen Raum, u: *Die Kupferzeit als historische Epoche*, Teil 1, Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 55, Saarbrücken, 259-264.
- Čečuk B., Radić D., 2005, *Vela spila. Višeslojno pretpovijesno nalazište – Vela luka, otok Korčula*, Centar za kulturu "Vela Luka", Vela Luka
- Čović B., 1976, Metalurška djelatnost vučedolske grupe u Bosni, u: *Alojz Benac sexagenario dicatum*, *GodCenBallsp XIII/11*, Sarajevo, 105-115.
- Čović B., 1991, *Pod kod Bugojna. Naselje bronzanog i željeznog doba u centralnoj Bosni*, Sveska 1: Rano bronzano doba, Posebno izdanje Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo
- Dimitrijević S., 1970, Zur Frage der kannelierten Keramik in der Hvar-Kultur, u: *Adriatica praehistorica et antiqua. Zbornik radova posvećen Grgi Novaku*, Zagreb, 105-122.
- Dimitrijević S., 1980, Zur Frage der Retz-Gajary-Kultur in Nordjugoslawien und ihrer Stellung im pannonischen Raum, *BRGK 61*, Frankfurt a/M, 15-89.
- Dimitrijević S., 1982, Die frühe Vinkovci-Kultur und ihre Beziehungen zum Vučedoler Substrat im Lichte der Ausgrabungen in Vinkovci (1977/78), *OpuscA 7*, Zagreb, 7-36.
- Durman A., 2000, Počeci metalurgije na brodskom području, u: *Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa o Slavonskom Brodu u povodu 750. obljetnice prvoga pisanog spomena imena Broda*, Slavonski Brod, 91-102.
- Forenbaher S., 1987, Vlaška peć kod Senja, *OpuscA 11-12*, Zagreb, 83-97.
- Forenbaher S., 1999-2000, "Nakovana Culture": State of Research, *OpuscA*, 23-24, Zagreb, 373-385.
- Forenbaher S., Kaiser T., 2000, Grapčeva spilja i apsolutno datiranje istočnojadranskog neolitika, *VAHD 92*, Split, 9-34.
- Garašanin D., 1987, Die Herkunft der westserbischen Hügelgräber, u: *Hügelbestattung in der Karpaten-Donau-Balkan Zone während der Äneolithischen Periode*. Internationales Symposium – Donji Milanovac 1985, Izdavači: Centar za arheološka istraživanja, Filozofski fakultet u Beogradu, Balkanološki institut SANU u Beogradu, Beograd, 51-55.

- Garašanin M., 1991, Verspätetes Neolithikum, Spätneolithikum und beginnende Kupferzeit in Südosteuropa, *GodCenBallsp XXIX/27*, Sarajevo, 5-22.
- Garašanin M., Garašanin D., 1959, Nova iskopavanja na Velikoj Humskoj Čuki kod Niša, *Starinar IX-X*, Beograd, 243-255 (ćiril.)
- Govedarica B., 1985, O istraživanju glasićkih gradina, *Materijali SADJ XX*, Beograd, 15-27.
- Govedarica B., 2001, Die Funde vom Typ Cernavoda III – Boleraz im ehemaligen Jugoslawien, u: *Cernavoda III – Boleraz. Ein vorgeschichtliches Phänomen zwischen dem Oberrhein und der unteren Donau*, Bucuresti, 358-368.
- Imamović E., 1996, Rezultati probnih iskopavanja u Podastinju, Višnjici i Gromiljaku kod Kiseljaka, *GZMS Arh 47*, Sarajevo, 61-92.
- Jamaković O., 1986, Bijelića glavica. Eneolitsko naselje, *ArhPregl 26* (1985), Ljubljana, 51.
- Jamaković O., 1986a, Gradina / Bočac. Neolitsko naselje, *ArhPregl 26* (1985), Ljubljana, 38-39.
- Jamaković O., 1991, Neolitsko naselje Kovačica kod Kotor Varoši, *GZMS Arh 46*, Sarajevo, 53-58 (objavljeno 2005).
- Korošec J., 1946, Pećina Hrustovača, novi lokalitet slavonske kulture, *GZMS I*, Sarajevo, 7-37.
- Korošec P., 1967, Neke pojave u istočnoalpskom području u vezi sa kulturom zvonolikih pehara Italije, *ARadRaspr IV-V*, Zagreb 299-318.
- Kosorić M., 1965, Probni arheološki radovi na lokalitetu "Brdo" u Dvorovima, *ČlanGradKIIB VI*, Tuzla, 91-94.
- Kosorić M., 1978, Rezultati probnih radova na lokalitetu Njive kod Patkovače, *ČlanGradKIIB XII*, Tuzla, 17-18.
- Kosorić M., 1982, Rezultati istraživanja praistorijskih naselja na području Semberije, *ČlanGradKIIB XIV*, Tuzla, 121-132.
- Kujundžić-Vejzagić Z., 2001, Pećina pod lipom – paleolitsko stanište na Glasinačkoj visoravni, *GZMS Arh 48/49*, Sarajevo, 33-89.
- Marijanović B., 1978, Fragment eneolitske keramike iz Badnja, *GZMS Arh 32* (1977), Sarajevo, 177-180.
- Marijanović B., 1980-81, Ravlića pećina (Peć-Mlini), *GZMS Arh 35/36*, Sarajevo, 1-91.
- Marijanović B., 1989, Kasna butmirska kultura u eneolitu, *GZMS Arh 44*, Sarajevo, 39-60.
- Marijanović B., 1991, Kasna hvarsko-lisičićka kultura u eneolitu, u: *Zbornik radova posvećenih akademiku Alojzu Bencu*, Posebna izdanja ANUBiH, XCV, Odjeljenje društvenih nauka, 27, Sarajevo, 185-192.
- Marijanović B., 1991a, Ljubljanska kultura na istočnoj jadranskoj obali, *VAHD 84*, Split, 215-245.
- Marijanović B., 1992, Neka pitanja eneolitika istočnog Jadrana, *Diadora 14*, Zadar, 5-21.
- Marijanović B., 2000, *Prilozi za prapovijest u zaleđu jadranske obale*, Monografije Filozofskog Fakulteta u Zadru 2, Zadar
- Marijanović B., 2001, Prusac (Biograd) – prapovijesno višeslojno nalazište – eneolitički slojevi, *GZMS 48/49*, Sarajevo, 90-114.
- Marković Z., 2002, Ranobrončanodobna faza vučedolske kulture u zapadnoj Bosni i sjevernoj Hrvatskoj, u: *Spomenica Alojzu Bencu*, *GodCenBallsp XXXII/30*, Sarajevo, 141-160.
- Nikolić D., 2000, *Kostolačka kultura na teritoriji Srbije*, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Filozofski fakultet, Centar za arheološka istraživanja, Knjiga 19, Beograd
- Odavić Đ., 1986, Biograd, Prusac, srednjovjekovni grad, *ArhPregl 25* (1983-1984), Beograd, 77.
- Periša D., 2003, Brunislav Marijanović, Prilozi za prapovijest u zaleđu jadranske obale, *AVes 54*, Ljubljana, 422-438.
- Raunig B., 2001, Prahistorijski nalazi na srednjovjekovnom gradu Cazin, *GZMS 48/49*, 115-163.
- Roman P., 1977, *The Late Copper Age Coțofeni Culture of South-East Europe*, *BARSUPP Ser 32*, Oxford
- Skelac G., 1997, Prapovijesno nalazište Slavča, *OpuscA 21*, Zagreb, 217-233.
- Žeravica Z., 1983, Ostaci badenskog naselja na Kastelu u Banja Luci, u: *Arheološka problematika zapadne Bosne*. ZborADBiH, Sarajevo, 41-53.
- Žeravica Z., 1993, *Äxte und Beile aus Dalmatien und andere Teilen Kroatiens, Montenegro, Bosnien und Herzegovina*, PBF IX/18, Stuttgart

Darko Periša