

C.F.E. Pare, Beiträge zum Übergang von der Bronze zur Eisenzeit in Mitteleuropa, Teil I - Grundzüge der Chronologie im östlichen Mitteleuropa (11. - 8. Jahrhundert v. Chr.) Jahrbuch RGZM 45, 1, Mainz 1998, 293-433.

Primljeno/Received: 2002. 04. 10.  
Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 2002. 04. 11.

Nives Majnarić-Pandžić  
HR 10000 Zagreb  
Odsjek za arheologiju  
Filozofskog fakulteta  
I. Lučića 3

Neuobičajeno je prikazivati studije tiskane u znanstvenim časopisima, no u ovom se slučaju radi o opsežnoj raspravi, pripremanoj i najavljivanoj dulje vrijeme, a osim toga ona duboko zahvaća u kronološku problematiku našega područja, pa to ovaj prikaz čini potrebnim.

Studija se predstavlja već naslovom - želi doprinijeti spoznaji kronologije prijelaznog razdoblja iz brončanog u željezno doba u Srednjoj Europi. Ovdje je objavljen prvi dio koji govori o temeljima kronologije u istočnom dijelu Srednje Europe u vremenu od 11. do 8. stoljeća stare ere. Autor napominje da je na ovoj studiji radio gotovo deset godina, poduprt od raznih njemačkih znanstvenih institucija, stipendija i kolega. U *uvodu* naglašava da nije nužno proučavati kronološki tijek samo na osnovi tehnoloških promjena i samo na njima zasnivati prikaz vremenskih etapa već se pri tom razrađivanju treba osloniti na niz drugih pokazatelja, na pr. ekonomskih, socioloških, duhovnih i moralnih (sic!) procesa. Reducirati pažnju samo na tehnološki razvoj, tvrdi Pare, ne može biti pravilan i potpun pristup kronološkim pitanjima. Autor tumači dalje da je kriva ideja o tehnološkim promjenama kao uvijek progresivnima i lako prepoznatljivima u arheološkoj ostavštini. Podcrtava jednostranost takvog mišljenja, bliskog samo "zapadnjačkom" mentalitetu. U namjeri da osvježi i olabavi taj "tvrđi" pogled na vrednovanje tehnološkog napretka C. Pare navodi razne primjere i moguće modele u poglavlju *Tehnologija i napredak*. Sljedeći korak je *Tehnološka inovacija i društvena promjena* gdje su predočene različite mogućnosti interpretacije.

Sva ova uvodna, zanimljiva poglavlja počivaju na najnovijoj teorijsko-metodološkoj literaturi, a autoru služe da "razbije" već odavno ustaljene kronološke

okvire u europskoj literaturi, osobito za u ovoj studiji promatrano vrijeme. Autor si zadaje cilj da predstavi različite nalaze iz gornje Italije, sa zapadnog Balkana, jugoistočnih Alpa te iz sjeveroistočnog alpskog predprostora, Karpatske kotline i Donjeg Dunava. Prilično ambiciozan zadatak, pogotovo uzmu li se u obzir neujednačeni stupanj istraživanja i objavljivanja, mnoštvo autora i već izgrađenih i primjenjivanih regionalnih kronoloških sustava!

Pritom autor objašnjava da će zbog izbjegavanja mogućih nesporazuma odustati od uvođenja novih naziva za kronološke stupnjeve te od navođenja pojedinih kulturnih grupa. Znači da teži izradi globalnog kronološkog sustava, sinkroniziranog na ogromnom i kulturno vrlo heterogenom prostoru. Kao da se želi vratiti u vrijeme starih, ujednačenih kronoloških sistema, npr. Reineckeovog ili Monteliusovog.

Svoje kronološke usporedbe započinje s u novije vrijeme dobro istraživanim i objavljenim gornjoitalskim grupama i kronologijama. Uz regionalno dodaje i svoj prijedlog za modifikaciju pojedinih faza. Iako uglavnom preuzima već gotove kronološke podjele, donosi i neke detalje preuzete iz novih talijanskih publikacija (npr. horizontalnu stratigrafiju bolonjskog groblja San Vitale i tipologiju igala). Predstavlja tako novu talijansku kronologiju za Bolognu, Este i Picenum. Posebno naglašava značenje arheoloških prilika i razvoja u Picenumu, on mu je *kronološki posrednik između srednje Italije i istočne jadranske obale*. Znači, autor traži posredovanje za prenošenje kronoloških faza sa zapadne na istočnu jadransku obalu, a zatim, vidjet ćemo, i u duboko zaleđe, u stvari sve do srednjeg Balkana. Podjelu picenskih faza C. Pare preuzima i ilustrira iz Beinhauerove sinteze (Beinhauer 1985).

U sljedećem poglavlju Pare obuhvaća prostor koji nas ovdje posebno zanima: *Zapadni Balkan i jugoistočni predalpski prostor*. Zbog zemljopisnog položaja autor naglašava da je ovo područje ključno za kronološka istraživanja. Na osnovi metalnih predmeta vidi jasno izražena dva ranoželjeznodobna horizonta: imenuje ih Dalmacija I i II i prati ih sinkronizmom u jugoistične Alpe u fazu Ljubljana I b i II. Stariji horizont obilježavaju žičani i limeni dijelovi nošnja, a mlađi lijevani; sinkronizira faze Vergina III A-B, Glasinac I A i Ljubljana I b. Pare je vrlo zadovoljan s nadaleko razapetom mrežom međusobno sličnih oblika nošnje i ne pomišlja na to da nema zapravo dokaza da su na tom doista ogromnom prostoru svi istovremeno nosili istu opremu.

Istočnojadransku obalu Pare promatra u djelu Š. Batovića (Batović 1965, 1976, 1981, 1983, 1987. i drugi radovi). Obilno ga citira, navodeći i njegove promjene nazora o kronološkoj podjeli brončanog i starijeg željeznog doba u Liburniji. Prihvaća posljednju Batovićevu procjenu da željezno doba u Liburna počinje početkom 9. st. stare ere. Pare će Batovićev kronološki sustav, izrađen za Liburniju i u okviru liburnskih faza željeznog doba, uzeti za osnovicu podjele cijele istočne jadranske obale. Tko poznaje tamošnje prilike znat će da naziv *Dalmatien* nije prikladan. Za završno brončano doba između Istre i Dalmacije navodi tipove značajne u Italiji za mlađe protovilanovsko razdoblje. U našem području spominje navodni grob iz Grižana (sl. 15) ali on je posve upitan kao cjelina (provjereno u inventaru Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, zahvaljujem D. Balen-Letunić). Sve tipične nalaze određuje prema italskoj kronologiji (*nach der italischen Chronologie zu urteilen*), iako obilato citira Batovićeve regionalne faze. Dobro razrađenu kronologiju početaka starijeg željeznog doba za Istru iz 1987. ni ne spominje (Gabrovec-Mihovilić 1987), a ona bi sigurno bila potrebna za razradu prilika na istočnoj jadranskoj obali u to vrijeme. U bilješci 51 (str. 329) navodi kao primjer uskih veza među različitim kulturnim grupama na zapadnom i istočnom Jadranu žarne grobove s japodskog terena u Lici, npr. grob 2 iz Kompolja, povezujući ga sa sličnima iz Ancone i Sirola u Picenumu; vrlo vjerojatne veze protojapodske kulture s kompaktnim kulturnim krugom kulture polja sa žarama u južnoj Panoniji ni ne spominje. Prema objavama citira dalje nalaze karakteristične za rano željezno doba I i II, oslanjajući se često na nalaze iz Kompolja, a zatim i iz Nina. Kao da previda značajnu i neumoljivu činjenicu velebitske planinske barijere koja je doduše dozvoljavala komunikaciju preko gorskih prijelaza, ali je razbijala jedinstvenost ovog područja, - obalnog i onog iza visoke planine. Treba tek dokazati ujednačeni ritam njihova kulturnog i općenitog razvoja. Usko povezivanje, gotovo izjednačavanje, liburnske i japodske materijalne kulture zasniva očito na pogledima i objavi F. Lo-Schiavo iz 1970.

Glasinac je opet svijet za sebe, smješten na teže pristupačnom području iznad rijeke Drine, na granici

zapadnog i središnjeg Balkana, prostirući se u priličnoj mjeri i na središnji Balkan. Oduvijek, kako je poznato, orijentiran prema sjeveru ili sjeverozapadu te jugu i istoku, on je u Pareovoj studiji direktno povezan s italskim razvojem. B. Čović, vrlo dobro citiran u opširnoj Pareovoj bibliografiji, posvetio je velik dio svog inače vrlo plodnog znanstvenoistraživačkog rada upravo glasinačkoj kulturi (Čović 1959, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1979, 1982, 1983, 1986, 1987). Njegova kronološka shema glasinačkog razvoja predočava upravo ono što je povijesno bitno: kontinuitet naseljavanja, kulturnog i ritualnog života, odraženog među ostalim i u konzekventnom sahranjivanju u tumulima, od ranog brončanog do kraja starijeg željeznog doba (Glasinac I - V s podfazama). Naročito je to naglašeno izrečeno za prijelaz iz kasnog brončanog u starije željezno doba (Glasinac III C2 u IV a) (Čović 1987, 590). Već je N. Lucentini u objavi svoje disertacije, bez zadovoljavajućeg tumačenja, razbila ovaj terminološki odraz kontinuiteta života i razvoja kulture uvodeći za početke željeznog doba fazu I. (Lucentini 1981). Velika je šteta da B. Čović u svojoj posljednjoj opširnoj sintezi o glasinačkoj kulturi (Čović 1987, 581) nije konkretnije reagirao na studiju Lucentinijeve, do li lapidarnom rečenicom *Prijedlog nove kronološke podjele glasinačke kulture željeznog doba dala je N. Lucentini, uz dosta svježih ideja, ali bez pravog razumijevanja unutrašnje dinamike razvoja na centralnobalkanskom području*.

Inače, već je sam B. Čović podigao početak glasinačkog starijeg željeznog doba u vrijeme prijelaza 9. u 8. st. pr. Kr. - Glasinac IV a, pa se prema tome u Pareovoj kronologiji ne radi o nekom revolucionarnom podizanju apsolutnog datuma za početak starijeg željeznog doba, nego o *terminološkom izražavanju*. Pare izjednačuje Čovićevu fazu Glasinac III c2 s početkom starijeg željeznog doba I. O ranim počecima željeznog doba već se mnogo pisalo i njegovo je određivanje u 9. do 8. st. pr. Kr. već prihvaćena činjenica (Gabrovec 1973, 1976, 1981; Teržan 1986; Čović 1987 - da spomenem samo domaće autore; mogu se dodati i predavanja sa simpozija u Regensburgu iz 1994).

Pare preuzima naziv Glasinac I za ranu fazu željeznog doba na Glasincu od N. Lucentini (Lucentini 1981) i podiže je u 9. st. što posve odgovara trendu dizanja kronologije u posljednjem deceniju u europskim arheološkim studijama. Tim nastojanjima na čelu svakako stoje dendrokronološka ispitivanja pilota i drugih građevinskih ostataka iz sojeničkih jezerskih naselja na području od Švicarske do Austrije koja su sintezno predstavljena i primijenjena na arheološko gradivo u monografiji L. Sperbera (Sperber 1987). Ostavljajući po strani Sperberovu metodologiju spajanja relativnokronoloških faza dobivenih tipološkom analizom s apsolutnim datumima postignutima dendrokronološkim analizama, konstatiramo da su uobičajene relativno-kronološke faze - ishodišno Reineckeove, a modificirane po Müller-Karpeu (Müller-Karpe 1959) u Sperberovoj

sinkronističkoj kronološkoj tabeli (Sperber 1987, 234) dobile nove vremenske okvire. Ovdje ističem Ha B 1 u 11. stoljeće, Ha B 2 u kraj 11. s trajanjem do ranog 9. stoljeća (postojanje faze Ha B 2 neki autori posve negiraju, pa tako i C. Pare na nekim sinkronističkim tablicama (str. 405, tab. 5), a Ha B3 u 9. i prvu polovicu 8. st. pr. Kr. Tu se, dakle, pojavila već odluka da se odavno prihvaćene relativnokronološke faze odrede u druga, apsolutno bitno ranija vremena. Koliko je to opravdano pokazat će budućnost. Ipak, izjednačiti Reineckeovu halštatsku fazu C, odavno prihvaćenu kao oznaku za 7. st. stare ere, s 9. stoljećem čini se nepotrebnim. Regionalni kronološki sustavi, koji svakako najtočnije odražavaju dinamiku povijesnog razvoja nekog područja, promatranu na konkretnim arheološkim podacima, riješili su činjenicu ranijeg početka starijeg željeznog doba na prikladniji način, ne mijenjajući ustaljene nazive, a ipak izražavajući povijesnu sliku kakva nam je na sadašnjem stupnju istraženosti dostupna. Na pr. tu je faza Istra I, pa Ljubljana II itd. Zanimljivo je da se C. Pare, iako u sljedećim poglavljima prelazi na željezno doba Makedonije, ne osvrće na visoke početke željeznog doba u Istri (Gabrovec-Mihovilić 1987), a uopće ne spominje prisutnost glasinacke kulture u zapadnoj Srbiji, istočnoj Hercegovini, Crnoj Gori i Albaniji. Kao da uopće nije čitao bogatu literaturu citiranu npr. u *Praistoriji jugoslavenskih zemalja V*, a navedenu i u njegovu vlastitom popisu konzultiranih publikacija na kraju studije. Dakako da su te studije ili objave pisane na jeziku (jezicima) koji se malo znaju (*slavica non leguntur*), a govori ih relativno mali broj ljudi; ipak, znanstvenik u želji da rješava pitanja u takvim zemljama mora naći načina da temeljito upozna dotičnu literaturu. Moraju li antropolozi ili etnolozi, pristigli među par stotina pripadnika nekog afričkog ili južnoameričkog plemena, naučiti njihov jezik žele li spoznati istinu o njima, morao bi temeljiti uvid u literaturu osigurati i svaki znanstvenik baveći se takvim specifičnim pitanjima.

C. Pare se poziva na studiju Teržanove o nošnji žena (i grobnoj opremi muškaraca) na Balkanu, Donjem Podunavlju i u jugoistočnim Alpama (Teržan 1987). Doista je ona, s imponirajućim poznavanjem velikog broja relevantnih nalaza u svim njihovim pojedinostima, uočila veliku srodnost mode i običaja i izdvojila dva najstarija željeznodobna horizonta, ali ih je sinkronizirala s postojećim regionalnim kronološkim sustavima (Čovićevim za Glasinac IV a - c, i s Vasićevim za Srbiju). Apsolutne datume, nešto više od Čovićevih, postigla je "klasičnom" metodom oslanjajući se na import ili veze s mediteranskim svijetom. Reineckeovim fazama je ostavila njihove u literaturi ustaljene vremenske okvire.

Ovdje ne predstavljam poglavlje o ljubljanskoj i ruškoj grupi, jer su njihov razvoj već prikazali S. Gabrovac i B. Teržan (Gabrovec 1976, 1980; Teržan 1990), a Pare ih je samo ponovio i prodiskutirao kao potporu svojim tezama. Još manje se ovdje mogu

posvetiti prikazivanju razvoja krajeva sjeveroistočno od Alpa.

Spominjem samo još nekoliko Pareovih tvrdnji za naša nalazišta, odnosno kulturni razvoj u hrvatskom području; one svakako ostaju pod znakom pitanja. Tako se navodi da grupa Dobova - Velika Gorica neposredno zamjenjuje virovitičku, što je i inače ideja koja se javlja u najnovijoj literaturi (Dular 2002). Trebat će ipak vidjeti kako onda opredijeliti nalazišta grupe Zagreb (prema K. Vinski-Gasparini 1973), srodne i povezane s grupom Baierdorf-Velaticice. Mislim pritom na naselja na Kalniku, u Križevcima te na groblja u Vrapču i Horvatima kod Zagreba, da spomenem samo najmarkantnije. Nadalje, Pare navodi nalazište Šarengrad kao pripadnika bosutske kulture, a ono je prema dosadašnjoj evidenciji daljsko.

Tek usput neka bude spomenuto da prvi puta pronalazimo u tako eminentnom njemačkom časopisu kakav je Jahrbuch RGZM, najvišeg europskog ranga, nezgodne tiskarske pogreške: navodim samo one u imenima nalazišta: Vitrovica grupa (str. 405), Vârtop i Gârla Mare - posljednje čak i na sinkronističkoj tablici (str. 419).

Uz fenomen kanelirane kasnobrončanodobne keramike i njezinog širenja Podunavljem, što ovdje ostavljam po strani, Pare je znatnu pažnju posvetio kronologiji ostava. Za razdoblje koje prikazuje predstavlja tri vremenska uzastopna horizonta: IV, V, VI. Karakterizira ih u okviru zasebnih prostornih cjelina - naše ostave obuhvaća u poglavlju *Sjeverozapadni Balkan i jugoistočnoalpski pretprostor*, a razmatra još Karpatsku kotlinu i sjeveroistočno predalpsko područje. Niže popise ostava, ponešto i mijenja, uglavnom unosi manje promjene, nebitne za prikazivanje već ustaljenih regionalnih horizonata ostava. Upada u oči da je autor horizontima ostava namjerno ostavio terminološko određenje koje pokazuje njihovu ukorijenjenost u kulturu polja sa žarama, odnosno lokalne izraze tog kulturnog kruga. Kako smo vidjeli, Glasincu tu povezanost s ranijim kulturnim razvojem nije ostavio. To je učinio s teozom, pa se na sinkronističkim tablicama (npr. str. 339, Tab 3) jedne uz druge nižu stariježeljeznodobne kulture, poput Glasinca I A, Dalmacije I i Picenuma I, i horizonti ostava koji se uglavnom mogu sinkronizirati s dosadašnjim ostavama Ha B vremena. Upravo se na spomenutoj tablici može očitati da starije željezno doba u nekim područjima počinje oko polovice 10. st. pr. Kr. a u drugima opet do značajnih promjena koje nagovještavaju željezno doba dolazi tek u 8. st. pr. Kr. Na str. 425 to je ispreplitanje riješeno tako da horizont ostava V (nekadašnji Ha B2 horizont), određen u vrijeme od polovice 10. do kraja 9. st. pr. Krista, ujedno predstavlja i kasnu fazu kulture polja sa žarama i rano željezno doba I. U posljednjem poglavlju C. Pare daje veliku povijesnu fresku, baziranu na svim ranijim zapažanjima; upravo tu naglašava razliku između grupa tradicionalno vezanih uz kulturu polja sa žarama i onih grupa kojih ranoželjeznodobni razvoj započinje već u drugoj

polovici 10. st. Ta velika povijesna rekonstrukcija zbivanja u 8. st. stare ere kao da zamjenjuje onu Holsteovu o "tračko-kimerijskom udaru". Dabome, Holsteova je počivala samo na indicijama i kasnije se pokazala nerealnom, a Pareova raspolaže obilnim nalazima, podacima i već ranije priređenim interpretacijama. C. Pare podiže tako pred nama luk velikog raspona od Crnog mora do tirenske obale. Posvuda u tom luku nižu se kulture srodnih obilježja, naročito označene konjskom opremom karpatskih i podunavskih svojstava.

U Pareovoj studiji dobili smo veliku sintezu, opširni pregled i sažetak najnovijih otkrića, upoznali niz novih grupa, njihovo mjesto u vremenskom i kulturnom smislu, sažeto doznali nove poglede i teorije o pojedinim problemima iz najnovije literature. Dakako da je niz problema ostao otvoren, a njihovo rješenje manje ili više naznačeno.

Ne sumnjam da je autor proputovao i studijski analizirao nalaze na ogromnom području koje obuhvaća u namjeri da međusobno sinkronizira već postojeće

regionalne kronologije, a neke od faza podijeli i na nov način. Ne bi, dabome, bilo dobro da je većinu nalaza i cjelina prosuđivao samo po literaturi. Mislim, ipak, da je niz radikalnih novosti i promjena u dosadašnjim vrijedećim kronološkim sustavima, uvedenih u Pareovoj studiji, doveo do potrebe da se u pojedinim regijama brzo pristupi procjeni Pareovih prijedloga i rješenja. Prije nego li se to provede, i dok se ne vidi recepcija Pareovih zaključaka, mislim da ne bi trebalo bez tumačenja preuzeti nove vremenske okvire za odavano ustaljene i u opsežnoj stručnoj literaturi upotrebljavane pojmove, kao što su Ha B i Ha C. Upravo se takvo preuzimanje visokih datuma za Ha C, a bez ikakvog objašnjenja, pojavilo u najnovije vrijeme u našoj literaturi - u katalogu izložbe o Žumberku (Škoberne 2002 a i b) koji je, kao svaki tekst u katalogima izložbi, napisan bez aparata. Mnogi zainteresirani, osobito studenti arheologije i povijesti, naći će se tako pred enigmom koju bez vrlo zauzetog i detaljnog proučavanja Pareove studije neće moći riješiti. Upravo je to i bio razlog pisanja ovog prikaza.

## POPIS LITERATURE

- Batović 1976 Š. Batović, Le relazioni culturali tra le sponde adriatiche nell' età dell ferro, Jadranska obala u protohistoriji, Zagreb.
- Batović 1981 Š. Batović, Nakit na tlu sjeverne Dalmacije od prapovijesti do danas, Zadar.
- Batović 1983 Š. Batović, Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja IV, Sarajevo.
- Batović 1987 Š. Batović, Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja V, Sarajevo.
- Beinhauer 1985 K.W. Beinhauer, Untersuchungen zu den eisenzeitlichen Bestatungsplätzen in Novilara.
- Čović 1959 B. Čović, Glasinac 1957. Rezultati revizionog iskopavanja ..., Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja 14, Sarajevo.
- Čović 1963 B. Čović, Pogrebni običaji praistorijskih stanovnika glasinačkog područja, GZM 18, Sarajevo.
- Čović 1964 B. Čović, Osnovne karakteristike materijalne kulture Ilira na njihovom centralnom području, Simpozijum... Sarajevo.
- Čović 1965 B. Čović, Novi nalazi sa nekropole "Gradac" u Sokocu i neka pitanja glasinačke kronologije, Članci i građa VI, Tuzla.
- Čović 1979 B. Čović, Kneževski grobovi glasinačkog područja, Sahanjivanje kod Ilira, Beograd.
- Čović 1982 B. Čović, Neka pitanja hronologije bronzanog doba glasinačkog područja, GZM 35-36, Sarajevo.
- Čović 1983 B. Čović, Glasinačka kulturna grupa, Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja IV, Sarajevo.
- Čović 1986 Die Ethnogenese der Illyrier, Ethnogenese europäischer Völker aus der Sicht Anthropologie..., Stuttgart-New York.
- Čović 1987 B. Čović, Glasinačka kultura, Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja V, Sarajevo.
- Dular 2002 I. Dular i dr., Oloris - naselje bronzaste dobe pri Dolnjem Lakošu, Ljubljana.
- Gabrovec 1973 S. Gabrovec, Zečetek halštatskega obdobja v Sloveniji, AV 24, Ljubljana.
- Gabrovec 1976 S. Gabrovec, Zum Beginn der Hallstattzeit in Slowenien, Festschrift R. Pittioni, Wien.
- Gabrovec 1980 S. Gabrovec, Der Beginn der Hallstattkultur und der Osten, Die Hallstattkultur, Frühform der europäischen Einheit, Steyr.
- Gabrovec 1981 S. Gabrovec, Die Verbindungen zwischen den Südostalpen und dem jugoslawischen Donaugebiet in der älteren Eisenzeit, Die ältere Eisenzeit..., Novi Sad.
- Gabrovec-Mihovilić 1987 S. Gabrovec-K.Mihovilić, Istarska grupa, Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja V, Sarajevo.
- Lo Schiavo 1970 F. Lo Schiavo, Il gruppo liburnico-japodico, Atti... dei Lincei VIII, XIV, Roma.
- Lucentini 1981 N. Lucentini, Sulla cronologia della necropoli di Glasinac nell' età del ferro, Studi di protostoria adriatica 1, Roma.
- Müller-Karpe 1959 H. Müller-Karpe, Beiträge zur Chronologie... RGF 22, Berlin.
- Regensburg 1994 Archäologische Untersuchungen zum Übergang der Bronze - zur Eisenzeit zwischen Nordsee und Kaukasus (Izd. W. Torbrügge), Bonn.
- Sperber 1987 L. Sperber, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Urnenfelderkultur im Nördlichen Alpenvorland von der Schweiz bis Oberösterreich, Bonn.

- Škoberne 2002 a      Ž. Škoberne, *Žumberak od prapovijesti do kasne antike*, Zagreb, 72.  
Škoberne 2002 b      Ž. Škoberne, *Oživljene kulture*, Ljubljana, 62.  
Teržan 1987         B. Teržan, *The Early Iron Age Chronology of the Central Balkans*, *Arch. Jugoslavica* 24, Ljubljana.  
Teržan 1990         B. Teržan, *Starejša železna doba na slovenskem Štajerskem*, Ljubljana.  
Vasić 1977         R. Vasić, *The Chronology of the Early Iron Age... of Serbia*, BAR 31, Oxford.  
Vinski-Gasparini 1973      K. Vinski-Gasparini, *Kultura polja sa žarama u sjevernoj Hrvatskoj*, Zadar.

ENGLISH VERSION

C.F.E. PARE, "BEITRÄGE ZUM ÜBERGANG VON DER BRONZE ZUR EISENZEIT IN MITTELEUROPA, TEIL I – GRUNDZÜGE DER CHRONOLOGIE IM ÖSTLICHEN MITTELEUROPA (11.-8. JARHUNDERT V. CHR.)," *JARBUCH RGZM* 45, 1, MAINZ 1998, PP. 293-433.

It is unusual to review an article published in an academic journal, but in this case it is a matter of an extensive discussion, announced well in advance and prepared over a long period. This study additionally provides an in-depth consideration of the chronological problems of our region, so this review seems necessary.

The study's title effectively presents its content: it is an attempt to contribute to knowledge of the chronology for the period from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age in Central Europe. The article specifically covers the first part, which speaks of the foundations of the chronology in the eastern section of Central Europe during the period from the eleventh to the eighth centuries BC. The author states that he worked on this study for almost ten years, with the support of various German academic institutions, scholarships and colleagues. In the *Introduction* he stresses that it is not necessary to examine the chronological process solely on the basis of technological changes and then use them exclusively as the basis for an outline of chronological stages. Rather, such a breakdown has to depend on a series of other indicators, such as, for example, economic, sociological, spiritual and moral (sic!) processes. To reduce the focus of attention exclusively to technological development, Pare says, can be neither a correct nor complete approach to chronological questions. The author further asserts that the idea of technological changes as always progressive and easily recognisable in the archaeological heritage is erroneous. He underscores the unilateral nature of such views, familiar only to the "Western" mentality. With the intention of freshening and slackening this "rigid" view of the evaluation of technological progress, C. Pare cites diverse examples and possible models in his chapter *Technology and Progress*. The next step is *Technological Innovation and Social Change*, where various possibilities for interpretation are furnished.

All of these introductory, interesting chapters are undergirded by the most recent theoretical and methodological literature, employed by the author to "topple" the already well-established chronological framework used in European literature on the subject, particularly for the period observed in this study. The author's stated objective is to present various archaeological material from northern Italy, the western Balkans, the southeastern Alps and the north-eastern alpine foreland, the Carpathian basin and the lower Danube. This is quite an ambitious task, particularly if one bears in mind the unequal degree of research and

publication, the numerous authors and the already constructed and applied regional chronological systems!

The author explains that in order to avoid possible misunderstandings he refrained from introducing new terms for chronological phases and from mentioning individual cultural groups. This means that he aspires to the creation of a comprehensive chronological system, synchronised over an enormous and culturally very heterogeneous area. It is as though he is trying to return to the time of older, consolidated chronological systems, such as, for example, those of Reinecke or Montelius.

Pare begins his chronological comparisons with the recently well-researched and published upper Italian groups and chronologies. Together with the regional, he adds his own proposal for the modification of individual phases. Although he generally assumes already completed chronological divisions, he also brings in some details taken from more recent Italian publications (e.g. the horizontal stratigraphy of the San Vitale Cemetery in Bologna and the pin typology). He thus presents a new Italian chronology for Bologna, Este and Picenum. He emphasises in particular the meaning of archaeological circumstances and development in Picenum, i.e. it is a *chronological mediator between central Italy and the eastern Adriatic coast*. This means that Pare is seeking medium for the transfer of chronological phases from the western to the eastern Adriatic coast, and then, as we shall see, deep into its hinterland, actually well into the central Balkans. Pare takes and illustrates the division of Picenum phases from Beinhauer's synthesis (Beinhauer, 1985).

In the next chapter, Pare encompasses the area that has particular interest for us: *The Western Balkans and the Southeastern Pre-Alpine Region*. Due to its geographic position, Pare emphasises that this region is a key to chronological research. On the basis of metallic items, he sees two clearly evident Early Iron Age horizons: he calls them Dalmatia I and II and follows them by synchronism in the southeastern Alps in the Ljubljana Ib and II phases. The older horizon is characterised by attire ornaments made of wire and tin, while the younger one is marked by cast ornaments; he synchronises the Vergina III A-B, Glasinac I A and Ljubljana Ib phases. Pare is quite satisfied with this widely-stretched network of mutually similar forms of attire, and he does not consider that there is actually no evidence that all people in this truly enormous area were wearing the same form of attire simultaneously.

Pare considers the eastern Adriatic coast in the works of Š. Batović (Batović, 1965; 1976; 1981; 1983; 1987 and other works). He cites Batović copiously, noting his changes in view of the chronological division of the Bronze and Early Iron Age in Liburnia. He accepts Batović's last assessment that the Iron Age in Liburnia commenced at the beginning of the ninth century BC. Pare uses Batović's chronological system, developed for Liburnia within the Liburnian phase of the Iron Age, as the basis for the division of the entire eastern Adriatic coast. Anyone familiar with the circumstances in that area knows that the term *Dalmatia* is not appropriate. He cites types characteristic of Italy for the earlier proto-Villanovan period for the closing of the Bronze Age between Istria and Dalmatia. In this region, he mentions the alleged grave from Grižane (Fig. 15), but it is completely questionable as a grave unit (verified in the inventory of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb; I would like to thank D. Balen-Letunić). He discerns all of the typical findings by the Italian chronology (*nach der italischen Chronologie zu urteilen*), although he widely cites Batović's regional phases. He does not even mention the well developed chronology of the beginnings of the Iron Age for Istria from 1987 (Gabrovec-Mihovilić, 1987), but it would certainly be needed to analyse circumstances on the eastern Adriatic coasts during that period. In note 51 (p. 329) he cites the urnfield culture graves from the Iapodic territory in Lika as an example of the close ties between various cultural groups on the western and eastern Adriatic, e.g. grave 2 from Kompolje, linking it to similar ones from Ancona and Sirolo in Picenum; the very probable ties of the proto-Iapodic culture with the compact cultural circle of the urnfield culture in southern Pannonia are not even mentioned. In line with published works, he further cites findings characteristic of the Early Iron Age I and II, frequently depending on finds from Kompolje and from Nin. It is as though he overlooks the significant and insurmountable fact of the Velebit mountain barrier which certainly did allow some communication across mountain passes, but it also separated the unity of this region: the coastal belt from the zone behind this high massif. The unified rhythm of their cultural and overall development still needs to be proven. Associating, and almost equalising, Liburnian and Iapodic material culture is obviously based on the views and published work of F. Lo-Schiavo from 1970.

Glasinac is again a world unto itself, situated in a hardly accessible area above the Drina River, straddling the border between the western and central Balkans, extending to a considerable degree into the central Balkans. It is general knowledge that this zone has always been oriented toward the north or north-west and south and east, while in Pare's study it is directly tied to developments in Italy. B. Čović, very well-cited in Pare's extensive bibliography, dedicated a large part of his very productive scholarly and research work precisely to the Glasinac Culture (Čović, 1959; 1963; 1964; 1965; 1979; 1982; 1983; 1986; 1987). His chronological structure for the development of Glasinac presents precisely those aspects that are historically essential: continuity of settlement, cultural and ritual life, reflected, among other things, in consequent burials in tumuli, from the Early Bronze Age to the end of the Early Iron Age (Glasinac I-V with sub-phases). This is stated with particular emphasis for the transition from the Late Bronze to the Early Iron Age (Glasinac III C2 in IVa) (Čović, 1987:590). Already in the publication of her dissertation, N. Lucentini, without satisfactory interpreta-

tion, did away with this terminological reflection of continuity of life and development of cultures by introducing a Phase I for the beginnings of the Iron Age (Lucentini, 1981). It is unfortunate that Čović, in his last extensive synthesis on the Glasinac Culture (Čović, 1987:581), did not substantially react to Lucentini's study, with the exception of this rather lapidary sentence: "*A new chronological division of Glasinac Culture in the Iron Age has been proposed by N. Lucentini, with many fresh ideas, but without a real understanding of internal developmental dynamics in the central Balkan region.*"

Čović himself otherwise moved the beginning of the Early Iron Age in Glasinac to the turn of the ninth into the eighth century BC – Glasinac IVa. So in this vein, Pare's chronology is not some revolutionary movement of the absolute date for the beginning of the Early Iron Age; it is, rather, a matter of *terminological expression*. Pare equates Čović's Glasinac III c2 phase with the beginning of the Early Iron Age I. Much has already been written about the early beginnings of the Iron Age and its determination in the ninth to the eighth century BC is an already accepted fact (Gabrovec, 1973; 1976; 1981; Teržan, 1986; Čović, 1987 – to mention just the scholars from the area of the former Yugoslavia; one could also add the lectures from the symposium in Regensburg in 1994).

Pare assumes the term Glasinac I for the early phase of the Iron Age in Glasinac from Lucentini (Lucentini, 1981) and moves it up to the ninth century, which completely corresponds to the trend of moving up chronologies in European archaeological studies in recent decades. These efforts are certainly topped by dendrochronological examinations of piers and other construction artefacts from lake dwellings in the territory from Switzerland to Austria, which are synthetically presented and applied to the archaeological material in L. Sperber's monograph (Sperber, 1987). Leaving to one side Sperber's methodology of linking relative chronological phases obtained through typological analysis with absolute dates achieved by means of dendrochronological analyses, we can assert that the standard relative chronological phases – originally Reinecke's, but modified by Müller-Karpe (Müller-Karpe, 1959) – acquired new time frames in Sperber's synchronous chronological tables (Sperber, 1987:234). I would like to draw attention to dating of Ha B 1 into the eleventh century, Ha B 2 from the end of the eleventh to the early ninth century (the existence of phase Ha B 2 is denied by some authors, and even by Pare in some synchronous tables; p. 405, Table 5), and Ha B3 to the ninth and first half of the eighth century BC. What this therefore represents is a decision to place long accepted relative chronological phases into other, absolutely and essentially earlier periods. Only time will tell if this decision was justified. Nonetheless, equating Reinecke's Hallstatt phase C, long accepted as the designation for the seventh century BC, with the ninth century seems unnecessary. Regional chronological systems, which certainly most accurately reflect the dynamics of historical development in a given region – observed through the prism of concrete archaeological data – have resolved the fact of the earlier beginning of the Early Iron Age in a more appropriate manner, without altering established terms but nevertheless expressing the historical picture as accessible to us at the current level of research. For example, there is the Istria I phase, and then Ljubljana II, and so forth. It is interesting that Pare, although he moves on to the Iron Age in Macedonia in subsequent chapters, does not consider the early beginnings of the Iron Age in

Istria (Gabrovec-Mihovilić, 1987), nor does he make any mention of the presence of the Glasinac Culture in western Serbia, eastern Herzegovina, Montenegro and Albania. It is as though he did not even read the wealth of literature cited in, for example, *Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja V* (Prehistory of the Yugoslav Lands, vol. V), and other works that can be found in his own list of consulted publications at the end of his study. To be sure, these studies and publications are written in a language or languages that are not widely known (*slavica non leguntur*) and spoken by a small number of people; nevertheless, a scholar who wants to answer questions pertaining to such countries should find a way to become thoroughly familiar with the relevant literature. Just as anthropologists and ethnologists arriving among several hundred members of some African or South American tribe must learn their language if they want to acquire any accurate information on them, so too should every scholar undertake a thorough review of all relevant literature when dealing with a specific set of issues.

Pare refers to Teržan's study of women's dress (and men's grave accoutrements) in the Balkans, the lower Danubian region and in the southeastern Alps (Teržan, 1987). Teržan did indeed employ her impressive knowledge of a large number of relevant finds in all of their details, and observed great similarities in fashions and customs. She isolated the two oldest Iron Age horizons, but she synchronised them with the existing chronological systems (i.e. with Čović's for Glasinac IVA-c, and with Vasić's for Serbia). She achieved absolute dates, to somewhat greater effect than Čović, using the "classical" method by depending on imports or links with the Mediterranean world. She left Reinecke's phases within the time frames so well established in the literature.

Here I will not deal with the chapter on the Ljubljana and Ruše groups, because their development was already shown by S. Gabrovec and B. Teržan (Gabrovec, 1976, 1980; Teržan, 1990), and Pare only repeats them and discusses them as support for his theses. There is even less room here to discuss a presentation of development in regions north-east of the Alps.

I shall only mention several of Pare's other assertions about finds in our region, i.e. cultural development in Croatia, that certainly remain in question. He states that the Dobova-Velika Gorica group directly replaces the Virovitica, which is otherwise an idea that has appeared in the most recent literature (Dular, 2002). This then leaves the question of attribution and dating of the sites of the Zagreb group (according to K. Vinski-Gasparini, 1973), that is similar and linked to the Baierdorf-Velatic group, especially the settlement at Kalnik, in Križevci, and the graves in Vrapče and Horvati near Zagreb, to mention just the most remarkable. Pare further cites the finds at Šaregrad as belonging to the Bosut Culture, but according to all evidence obtained up to now they belong to the Dalj Culture.

Just as an aside, it should be noted that this is the first time we have found unfortunate printing errors in such an eminent German journal such as *Jahrbuch RGZM*, one of the highest ranking European journals. I will only mention those pertaining to the name of sites: Vitrovia group (p. 405), Vârtop and Gârla Mare – the latter even appears in a synchronous table (p. 419).

Together with the phenomenon of Late Bronze Age channelled pottery and its spread through the Danube

region, which I will leave to one side here, Pare dedicates considerable attention to the chronology of hoards. He presents three consecutive chronological horizons for the period being shown: IV, V and VI. He characterises them within the framework of separate spatial units – the hoards from this region are encompassed in the chapter on *The North-western Balkans and Southern Alpine Foreland*, and he also considers the Carpathian basin and the north-eastern pre-Alpine zone. He provides a series of lists of hoards and introduces some changes, generally making just minor alterations, unimportant in the presentation of already established regional hoard horizons. It is quite noticeable that the author intentionally leaves the terminology for hoard horizons which show that they are grounded in the urnfield culture, i.e. local manifestations of this cultural circle. As we have seen, he does not make this same association between Glasinac and earlier cultural development. He did this with a thesis in mind, so that on the synchronous tables (for example p. 339, Table 3) the Early Iron Age cultures, such as Glasinac I A, Dalmatia I and Picenum I, are placed together with the hoard horizons that can generally be synchronised with the hoards that were dated into the Ha B phase. It is precisely in this table that one can see that the Early Iron Age began in some areas at around the mid-tenth century BC while in others the major changes that herald the Iron Age only came in the eighth century BC. On p. 425 this intertwining is resolved such that hoard horizon V (formerly the Ha B2 horizon), set at the mid-tenth century to the end of the ninth century BC, simultaneously represents the late phase of urn field culture and the early phase of Iron Age I. In the last chapter Pare paints an immense historical fresco, based on all earlier observations; it is here that he emphasises the difference between groups traditionally tied to urn field groups and those groups in which the early phase of the Iron Age already began in the second half of the tenth century BC. This great historical reconstruction of events in the eighth century BC seems to replace Holste's on the "Thracian-Cimmerian assault." To be sure, Holste's view rests solely on indications and were later proven unrealistic, while Pare has at his disposal extensive finds, data and earlier prepared interpretations. Pare thereby constructs before us a network of long distance relations from the Black Sea to the shores of the Tyrrhenian Sea. All along this route there are cultures with similar features, particularly designated by horse gear of Carpathian and Danubian characteristics.

In Pare's study we have a great synthesis, a broad overview and a summary of the latest discoveries. It familiarises us with a series of new groups, their position in the chronological and cultural sense, and we can learn about new views and theories on individual problems from the latest literature. Of course, an entire series of problems remain open, but their solutions are more or less indicated.

I do not doubt that the author has travelled widely and studiously analysed finds over an enormous territory which he encompassed with the intent of mutually synchronising already existing regional chronologies, and of dividing some of the phases in a new way. To be sure, it would not have been good if he had formulated his judgements on a majority of excavations and units exclusively on the basis of the scholarly literature. I believe, however, that the series of radical novelties and changes in the previously valid chronological systems introduced in Pare's study have led to the need, in the specific regions in question, to

quickly assess Pare's proposals and solutions. Before this is done, and until the reception to Pare's conclusions can be discerned, I believe that these new chronological frameworks for long accepted and widely used (in the scholarly literature) concepts, such as Ha B and Ha C, should not be appropriated without interpretation. Precisely such appropriation of high dates for Ha C, without any sort of explanation, has appeared very recently in Croatian litera-

ture: in the catalogue to the exhibition on Žumberak (Škoberne 2002 a and b) which was written without the necessary citations which is standard practice for texts in exhibition catalogues. Many of those interested, particularly students of archaeology and history, will therefore face an enigma that they will not be able to solve without a careful and thorough reading of Pare's study. This is in fact the motive underlying this review.

Translated by H. Potrebica