

**Sara Popović, *Starogradsko polje: studija arheološkog krajolika*,  
Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, Arheološki muzej u  
Zagrebu i Muzej Staroga Grada, 2020.: 255 str.**

**Silvia Bekavac i Željko Miletić, *Kulturni krajolik Biokova:  
reciklaže u kršu*, Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru i JU Park prirode  
Biokovo, 2024.; 210 str.**

JADRAN KALE

Sveučilište u Zadru, Odjel za etnologiju i antropologiju  
*University of Zadar, Department of ethnology and anthropology*  
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV., br. 2  
HR-23 000 Zadar  
jadran.kale@gmail.com

---

UDK: 902:911.5(497.583)

DOI: 10.15291/archo.5011

PRIKAZ / REVIEW

Primljeno / Received: 2025-07-01

Prihvaćeno / Accepted: 2025-07-15

---

Objavljivanje prvih krajobraznih monografija u hrvatskoj arheologiji predstavlja moment dovoljno zanimljiv za usporedni osvrt. Pisan za arheološku periodiku od jednog etnologa, naravno da će se zadržati na tom samom ulasku u krajolik, ostavljajući specifično arheološki sadržaj (poput analize lokaliteta ili povijesnih vrela) tome vičnim rukama. Starija je monografija prilagođeni doktorski rad Sare Popović koji je 2016. obranila pod mentorstvom Predraga Novakovića, renomiranoga krajobraznog arheologa koji je ovaj knjizi i jedan od recenzenata. Knjiga se dijeli na analitički (str. 7–167) i kartografski dio (str. 169–255). Uvod je razdijeljen u dijelove o kulturnim krajolicima i njihovoj zaštiti, zaštiti Starogradskega polja, sažetku povijesti Polja i dosadašnjim istraživanjima Staroga Grada i Polja. Kao predmet istraživanja deklarira se arheološka baština ruralnog prostora

The publication of the first landscape monographs in Croatian archaeology is a development interesting enough to warrant a comparative reflection. Written for an archaeological journal by an ethnologist, this review naturally restricts itself to being an entrée into the concept of landscape, leaving the specifically archaeological aspects (such as the analysis of sites or historical sources) to more specialised authors. The earlier monograph is an adaptation of a doctoral dissertation by Sara Popović, defended in 2016 under the supervision of Predrag Novaković, a respected landscape archaeologist who also served as one of the book's reviewers. The book is divided into an analytical (pp. 7–167), and a cartographic section (pp. 169–255). The introduction is structured into chapters on cultural landscapes and their protection, the protection of Starogradsko Polje (the Stari Grad Plain), a summary of the Polje's history, and previous re-

ra, napose od naselja i zidanih lokaliteta (str. 8). Historijat konzervacije, gotovo je preuzetno reći „zaštite” Polja, već i zbog konstatiranih razdoblja izvan registriranog statusa ili nepopraćenosti mjerama stručnog postupanja (str. 17), zbog unikatne naravi područja pripada u domaću hrestomatiju strukovne prakse. U pregledu dosadašnjih istraživanja istaknuta je važnost priključivanja engleskih arheologa, jer dolaze iz akademske tradicije u kojoj je krajobrazna arheologija i nastala (str. 29). U poglavlju „Dokumentiranje različitih vrsta arheološke baštine” (str. 37–65) predstavlja se metodologija istraživanja, krenuvši od „povijesnog krajolika” (str. 39) u kakvom se razgraničavaju prostori naselja i poljoprivrednih površina. Uz otprije raspoložive podatke geoinformatički su razvrstani rezultati projektnih bilježenja krajobraznog stanja, iz čega proizlaze klasifikacije i tipologije zatečenih oblika (str. 57–65). Glavni dio monografije predstavlja poglavlje „Retrogradna analiza stanja očuvanosti baštine” (str. 67–115), gdje se primjenom izložene metodologije utvrđuju promjene u krajoliku kako u recentno vrijeme fotografskih dokumentiranja tako i u dužem dosegu omogućenom povijesnim i kartografskim dokumentima. Za tim rezultatima slijede poglavlja „Vrednovanje očuvanosti baštine na osnovi retrogradne analize” (str. 117–129), „Rezultati studije i mogućnosti za buduća istraživanja” (str. 131–143) i zaključak (str. 145–150), prije kartografske polovice potankih izlaganja krajobraznih sekcija još popraćenih sažetkom na engleskom jeziku i bibliografijom. U tim su poglavljima rezultati izloženi kronološki i statistički. Izgledni smjerovi budućih istraživanja razdijeljeni su na smještaj lokaliteta unutar glavnog fenomena, podjelu suhozidnim međama, kao i na samu strukturu podjele. Kartografski pregled sekcija rezimiran je istom vrstom analize, koncipirane po poprečnim i uzdužnim osima Starogradskoga polja (str. 233–255).

Monografija o „kulturnom krajoliku Bioškova” rezultat je istraživačkog projekta i prak-

search on Stari Grad and the Polje. The declared subject of study is the archaeological heritage of this rural environment, particularly settlements and built sites (p. 8). The history of conservation here – perhaps overconfidently referred to as the “protection” of Polje, given that for significant periods it lacked registered status or expert professional oversight (p. 17) – has, owing to the area’s unique character, formed a part of the established canon of Croatian conservation literature. The author highlights the importance of including English archaeologists in the review of previous research, as they proceed from the academic tradition in which landscape archaeology first developed (p. 29). The chapter “Documenting Different Types of Archaeological Heritage” (pp. 37–65) presents the research methodology, beginning with the concept of the “historic landscape” (p. 39), within which a distinction between settlement areas and agricultural zones is made. Alongside previously available data, the results of project-based records of landscape conditions have been classified using geographic information systems, resulting in typologies and classifications of the observed forms (pp. 57–65). The main part of the monograph is the chapter “Retrograde Analysis of the State of Heritage Preservation” (pp. 67–115), where the proposed methodology is applied to identify landscape changes – both in the recent period covered by photographic documentation and over a longer timespan traceable through historical and cartographic sources. This is followed by the chapters “Evaluation of Heritage Preservation Based on Retrograde Analysis” (pp. 117–129), “Results of the Study and Possibilities for Future Research” (pp. 131–143), and the conclusion (pp. 145–150). Then comes a cartographic section, which occupies roughly half of the monograph and includes detailed presentations of landscape sections, accompanied by a summary in English and a bibliography. In these chapters, the results are presented both chronologically and statistically. Proposed future research should be focused on the location of individual sites within the main

ticirane nastave eksperimentalne arheologije s „elementima preliminarnog izvještaja” (str. 9–10). Nakon predgovora (str. 7–10) predstavlja se istraživani prostor Podglogovika na Biokovu (str. 13–27), prapovijesno polje humaka (str. 28–49), lokalitet tumula na Lokvi (str. 51–67), eksperimentalna obnova tumula (str. 69–79), poglavlje „Nestejci” (str. 80–89), „Od Peruna do Sv. Ilije” (str. 91–103), poglavlje posvećeno napuštenom selu Podglogovik (str. 104–121), „Stari putevi i Rodićeva cesta” (str. 123–135), „Topnički put i Prvi svjetski rat” (str. 137–151) te zaključak (str. 152–154). Sadržaj je popraćen bibliografijom (str. 155–160) i fotografskim ilustracijama (str. 162–210), koje uz naslove poglavlja asocirane poznatim pjesmama popularne glazbe pridonose ležernijem dojmu izdanja. Usprkos opažanim promjenama krajolika uslijed stočarskog korištenja, istraživani se teren karakterizira kao „djevičanska kulturna baština” (str. 7), a područje kao „bogat i kulturni krajolik s fosiliziranim tragovima raznovrsnih aktivnosti” (str. 28). U takvom se krajoliku tumuli načelno zoniraju (str. 29), predstavljajući metodologiju kao rekognosciranje i mapiranje svih vidljivih arheoloških struktura u kulturnom krajoliku, uz iskapanja pojedinih „dijagnostičkih tumula” (str. 33). Ovakvo „praćenje stratigrafije nataloženih kulturnih slojeva s ciljem utvrđivanja njihovih međusobnih odnosa” (str. 35) dovodi i do opažanja zanimljivosti tumula zbog „mogućih rješenja o samom prostiranju i kretanjima stočarskih zajednica na Biokovu tijekom pretpovijesnih razdoblja” (str. 51), no usporedba s recentnim transhumantnim stočarstvom ostaje na pretpostavci (str. 65). Iako se povijesno konstatira utjecaj krupnih državnih promjena na stočarstvo (str. 99), u etnografskom je srazu s jedinim spomenom aktualnog stočara riječ o „bitno drugačijoj” privredi zbog današnjih poljoprivrednih poticaja (str. 119). Iako su raniji prinosi utvrdili hvarski utjecaj na gradnju poljskih pseudokupola u makarskom kraju, uključujući i sam naziv „trim”, ocjenjuje

landscape complex, the division of space by dry-stone walls and the structure of that division. The cartographic overview of sections is summarised through the same analytical approach, structured along the transverse and longitudinal axes of Starogradsko Polje (pp. 233–255).

The monograph on the cultural landscape of Biokovo is the result of a research project and practical teaching in experimental archaeology, presented with “elements of a preliminary report” (pp. 9–10). Following the preface (pp. 7–10), the study presents the research area of Podglogovik on Biokovo (pp. 13–27); the prehistoric field of burial mounds (pp. 28–49); the tumulus site at Lokva (pp. 51–67); the experimental reconstruction of a tumulus (pp. 69–79); the chapter “The Nesti” (translator’s note: an Illyrian people, mentioned by Scylax as the *Nέστοι*) (pp. 80–89); “From Perun to St. Elias” (pp. 91–103); a chapter devoted to the abandoned village of Podglogovik (pp. 104–121); “Old Roads and Rodić’s Road” (pp. 123–135); “The Artillery Road and the First World War” (pp. 137–151); and the conclusion (pp. 152–154). The contents are supplemented by a bibliography (pp. 155–160) and photographic illustrations (pp. 162–210), which, together with chapter titles inspired by well-known popular songs, lend this publication a somewhat lighter tone. Despite the observed landscape changes resulting from pastoral activity, the study area is described as “virginal cultural heritage” (p. 7), and the broader region as a “rich cultural landscape with fossilised traces of diverse activities” (p. 28). Within such a landscape, tumuli are roughly zoned (p. 29), with the applied methodology defined as the reconnaissance and mapping of all visible archaeological structures in the cultural landscape, alongside the excavation of selected “diagnostic tumuli” (p. 33). This “observation of the stratigraphy of deposited cultural layers to determine their mutual relationships” (p. 35) has also led to findings highlighting the particular relevance of the tumuli for understanding “possible patterns of movement and distribution of pastoral communities

se kako je njihova gradnja povezana s biokovskim stočarskim selima (str. 118). Stočarsko se korištenje smatra prekinutim (str. 28 i dr.), proturječno konstatiranjima prisutnosti stoke na paši (str. 119). U načelnim spominjanjima učinaka turizma takav se krajolik pojavljuje i kao „djelomice obnovljen stari artificijelni pastirski pejzaž” (str. 120), a zaboravljeni put koji upotrebljava stoka i dalje je „neka vrsta muzejskog eksponata na otvorenom” (str. 132), s arheološkom ocjenom nastanka pretpovijesne staze radi pogreba (str. 154). Zaključno se rezimiraju milenijske identičnosti zatečenih uvjeta, kao i vrijednost „definiranja oblikovnih elemenata vernakularne arhitekture staja”, s istraživačkom perspektivom analize sakralnih mjesta.

Prve monografske studije krajobrazne arheologije predstavljaju dobrodošao domaći početak inovativne disciplinarne prakse. U skladu sa svjetskom praksom, koja širi arheološku ekspertizu s nalazišta i lokaliteta na prostor i krajolik kakav je novim tehnologijama postao evidencijski dohvaatan, a geoinformatički pregledan, korisno je istaknuti neka obilježja pristupa i prostora za dorade. Najkrupnije se, već od samih naslova ovih knjiga, odnosi na sam pojam kulturnog krajolika – dakle, bilo kultiviranog bilo kulturno važnog zbog pridavanih značenja. U obje su studije protagonisti takvih kultivacija prisutni tek incidentno, što napose upada u oči kad je izričito riječ o nastavi eksperimentalne arheologije. Nadovezana je arheološka karakterizacija krajolika iza kakve ostaje nejasno pripada li i npr. obnova stare sekcije suhozida primjenom istog načina slaganja u promijenjeni arheološki krajolik, ako bi se takav postupak na zidanoj arhitekturi već držalo konzervacijom. Pitanje „kontinuirane prisutnosti čovjekovog djelovanja” (Bekavac i Miletić, str. 35) može pripadati u devastaciju arheološkog lokaliteta ili u srž fenomena kulturnog krajolika, no i uz Novakovićevu eklektičnu tolerantnost ne daje ploda pokušava li se u isti mah rasporediti u oba koša. Perspektivnosti pristupa sva-

on Biokovo during prehistoric periods” (p. 51), while the comparison with recent transhumant herding remains hypothetical (p. 65). Although the historical overview recognises the influence of major political changes on pastoralism (p. 99), the ethnographic encounter with the only contemporary herder mentioned describes a “fundamentally different” economy shaped by today’s agricultural subsidies (p. 119). While earlier research established the influence of Hvar on the construction of field pseudo-domed huts in the Makarska area – including the very term *trim* (translator’s note: a local Dalmatian word of likely Romance origin, denoting a small corbelled dry-stone hut similar to the Istrian *kažun* or the Apulian *trullo*) – the authors argue that their construction is linked to Biokovo’s pastoral settlements (p. 118). Pastoral use of the landscape is generally considered discontinued (p. 28 and elsewhere), which contradicts the noted presence of grazing livestock (p. 119). In general remarks on the impact of tourism, such terrain is described as a “partially restored old artificial pastoral landscape” (p. 120), while an abandoned path still used by livestock is characterised as “a kind of open-air museum exhibit” (p. 132), accompanied by an archaeological interpretation of a prehistoric path built for burial purposes (p. 154). The conclusion summarises the millennial continuity of environmental conditions and highlights the value of “defining the formal elements of the vernacular architecture of cattle sheds”, with a research outlook directed toward the analysis of sacral sites.

These first monographic studies in Croatian landscape archaeology represent a welcome beginning for this innovative disciplinary practice. In line with international trends that have extended archaeological expertise from sites and finds to the broader landscape – now accessible through new documentation technologies and geoinformatics – it is useful to point out certain characteristics of approach and areas for refinement. The most fundamental issue, already evident from the titles of these books, concerns the very notion of the “cultural land-

kako će doprinijeti usvajanje sistematizacije vrela i drugih globalno usvojenih metodologija, već dovoljno predstavljenih u relevantnoj literaturi.

Prve se hrvatske monografije krajobrazne arheologije mogu shvatiti kao jedan od oblika antropologiziranja domaće postprocesne arheologije. Za razliku od kontinentalnih akademskih tradicija, usvajanje takvih teorijskih obrazaca često je segmentarno. U kolijevci krajobrazne arheologije, uostalom, kao i krajobrazne arhitekture – Engleskoj, ova je metodologija stasala u poslijeratnim okolnostima industrijskog pritiska na poljoprivredne površine. Otprije snažna kulturnoj baštini posvećena civilna scena utjecala je na oblike istraživanja prostranstava nedohvatnih ikakvoj konzervatorskoj službi. Kad se pri tome kolektivna mašta zanjela svemirskim dobom i komputacijskim uvjerljivostima, kao popratni učinak nastao je fenomen Stonehengea kakav danas poznajemo, tek tada postajući najvažnijim nacionalnim spomenikom. S druge strane disciplinarnog plota u istoj su sredini nastali i poljoprivredni poticaji, obeštećenja poljoprivrednika zbog tržišnih zaknutosti uslijed njihovih dugoročno vrijednih obzira. Segmentiranost krajobraznih mjera mogla se raspoznati nedavnim uvođenjem konzervatorskih obeštećenja vlasnika poljoprivrednih zemljišta s arheološki važnim nalazištima, ignorirajući ostale relevantne vrste registriranih kulturnih dobara poput samih kulturnih krajolika ili ključnih ambijenata prakticiranja određenih vrsta nematerijalnih kulturnih dobara.

S ovim uvođenjem novoga arheološkog predmeta istraživanja, u međuvremenu iskusanog i u više domaćih doktorskih radova, vrijedi rezimirati kako njegovo usvajanje kod nas nije stiglo naprečac da bi segmentirana metodologija mogla biti jedini primijenjeni obrazac. Sjevernodalmatinski su krajolici iz pera engleskih projektnih suradnika uspoređivani sa širokim krčevinskim ogradama sjeveroistočne Škotske još 80-ih godina 20. sto-

scape” – that is, whether it refers to cultivated land or to a landscape that is culturally significant due to the meanings ascribed to it. In both studies, the protagonists in this debate appear only incidentally – a fact particularly striking given that one of them explicitly concerns the teaching of experimental archaeology. The accompanying archaeological characterisation of the landscape leaves open the question of whether, for instance, the reconstruction of an old section of dry-stone wall using the same building technique within a transformed archaeological landscape should itself be regarded as part of that landscape, when similar work on built architecture would already be considered conservation. The notion of the “continuous presence of human activity” (Bekavac and Miletic, p. 35) could belong either to the category of archaeological site disturbance or to the very essence of the cultural landscape phenomenon, yet – despite Novaković’s eclectic openness – it bears little fruit if one attempts to assign it simultaneously to both. The potential of this approach will certainly benefit from the adoption of a systematic treatment of sources and other globally established methodologies, already amply presented in relevant literature.

The first Croatian monographs on landscape archaeology can be understood as a form of integration of anthropological approaches into domestic post-processual archaeology. In contrast to continental academic traditions, the adoption of such theoretical frameworks has often been fragmentary. In the cradle of landscape archaeology, as well as of landscape architecture – England – this methodology developed in the post-war circumstances of industrial pressure on agricultural land. A long-established civil society movement devoted to cultural heritage influenced the forms of research conducted in areas beyond the reach of any of conservation service. Hand in hand with the collective imagination becoming captivated by the space age and the persuasive potential of computational modelling, the phenomenon of Stonehenge as we know it

ljeća. I sama je eksperimentalna arheologija u potrazi za sjevernodalmatinskim lončarima stigla sa Sveučilišta u Newcastleu, istodobno s prvim razmatranjima krajobrazne arheologije. Prva geoinformatička obrada arheološkog terena tada se zbilila u istom ambijentu Starogradske polje gdje je prije deset godina obavljena prva geoinformatizirana evidencija kulturnog krajolika na narudžbu konzervatorskog ureda, koja je polučila i prvi doktorski rad te vrste kod nas. Kulturni su krajolici stvar kontinuiranoga poljodjelskog kultiviranja koliko i njegovanja kulture interdisciplinarnosti, čemu, nadajmo se, i ove prve monografije otvaraju vrata.

today emerged – only then becoming Britain's foremost national monument. On the other side of the disciplinary fence, agricultural incentives were introduced in the same environment – compensation schemes for farmers disadvantaged by market conditions but recognised for their long-term, environmentally valuable practices. The fragmentary nature of landscape-related measures has become apparent with the recent introduction of conservation compensations for owners of agricultural land containing archaeologically significant sites, while other relevant categories of registered cultural property – such as cultural landscapes themselves or key settings for practising certain forms of intangible heritage – have been overlooked.

With the introduction of this new archaeological research subject, already explored in several Croatian doctoral theses, it is worth summarising that its adoption in Croatia did not occur abruptly, and therefore a segmented methodology cannot be seen as the sole applicable model. Northern Dalmatian landscapes were compared by English project partners in the 1980s with the extensive enclosure systems of north-eastern Scotland. Experimental archaeology itself – seeking traces of northern Dalmatian pottery production – arrived from Newcastle University at the same time as the first considerations of landscape archaeology. The first geoinformatic processing of an archaeological area in Croatia took place within the same setting: Starigradske Polje, where, a decade ago, the first GIS-based documentation of a cultural landscape was carried out under the commission of the conservation office, resulting in the country's first doctoral thesis of this kind. Cultural landscapes are the product of continuous agricultural cultivation as much as of nurturing a culture of interdisciplinarity – something to which, it is to be hoped, these first monographs have now opened the door.

*Translation and proof-reading:  
ETNOtrend d.o.o.*