



AKADEMIJA NAUKA I UMJETNOSTI BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE
AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN UND KÜNSTE
VON BOSNIEN-HERZEGOWINA

GODIŠNJAK JAHRBUCH

Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja
Zentrum für Balkanforschungen
KNJIGA / BAND 47

Urednik / Herausgeber
Blagoje Govedarica

Redakcija / Redaktion
Dževad Juzbašić, Radoslav Katičić,
Lejla Nakaš, Aiša Softić, Aladin Husić

SARAJEVO 2018



FONDACIJA

ZA IZDAVAŠTVO
SARAJEVO

Štampano uz podršku Federalnog ministarstva obrazovanja i nauke, Evroazijskog odjeljenja
Njemačkog arheološkog instituta u Berlinu, Fondacije za izdavaštvo Federalnog ministarstva kulture
i sporta Bosne i Hercegovine i Münchner Zentrum für antike Welten-LMU München /
Gedruckt mit Unterstützung des Föderalen Ministeriums für Bildung und Wissenschaft
Bosnien-Herzegowinas, der Eurasien-Abteilung des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts in Berlin,
des Verlagsfond des Föderalen Ministeriums für Kultur und sport Bosnien-Herzegowinas
und Münchner Zentrum für antike Welten-LMU München

Sadržaj / Inhaltsverzeichnis

I

Proceedings of the first PeBA Conference Perspectives on Balkan Archaeology – The Early Iron Age: Methods and Approaches

Preface	5
<i>Milijan Dimitrijević</i>	
Socioeconomic relations and identities in the Southeastern Adriatic Iron Age Socioekonomski odnosi i identiteti u gvozdenom dobu Jugoistočnog Jadrana	7
<i>Mario Gavranović, Ajla Sejfuli</i>	
Early Iron Age in Central Bosnia – an overview and research perspectives Rano željezno doba srednje Bosne - pregled i perspektive istraživanja.....	27
<i>Daniela Heilmann</i>	
Visualizing Cultural Diversity The typology of one-looped bow fibulae with asymmetrical and rectangular plates Vizualiziranje kulturne raznolikosti Tipologija jednopetljastih lučnih fibula s asimetričnim i pravougaonim pločama.....	45
<i>Aleksandar Jašarević, Melisa Forić Plasto</i>	
The importance of small archaeological finds from Glasinac Važnost malih arheoloških nalaza sa Glasinca.....	59
<i>Aleksandar Kapuran</i>	
Chronological problems in the continuity of Iron Age cultural groups in Northeastern Serbia Hronološki problemi u kontinuitetu kulturnih grupa gvozdenog doba u severoistočnoj Srbiji	77
<i>Aleksandra Papazovska</i>	
New perspectives of the tumuli burials during the Iron Age in the Republic of Macedonia Нове перспективе о сахрањивању испод тумула у гвозденом добу Македоније	91
<i>Vojislav Filipović</i>	
Some Observations on Communications and Contacts in the Central Balkan and Neighbouring Regions During the 7th to 5th Century BC Based on the Distribution of Weapons Нека запажања о комуникацијамa и контактима на средњем Балкану и суседним областима на основу дистрибуције оружја током старијег гвозденог доба	105

II

Članci / Aufsätze

<i>Adnan Busuladžić</i>	
Metalwork from Roman doors – examples in Bosnia and Herzegovina Metalni dijelovi rimskih vrata – primjeri iz Bosne i Hercegovine	117
<i>Lejla Nakaš</i>	
Pismo natpisa stećaka The Script of Stećak Inscriptions.....	177
<i>Mehmed Kardaš</i>	
Novi listovi Vrutočkog bosanskog četveroevanđelja New sheets from the Bosnian Vrutok Gospels.....	193
<i>Aladin Husić</i>	
O organizaciji i načinu funkcioniranja sudske vlasti u kadiluku Tešanj u drugoj polovini 18. stoljeća On the Organization and the Functioning of Judiciary Authority in the Qadha of Tesanj in the Second Half of the 18 th Century.....	199
<i>Aiša Softić</i>	
Novinske osmrtnice i transnacionalna praksa u Bosni i Hercegovini Newspaper Obituaries and Transnational Practice in Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	215

III

Kritike i prikazi / Besprechungen

Adnan Busuladžić, Tragovi antičkog teatra, muzike, gladijatorskih borbi i takmičenja iz arheoloških zbirki u Bosni i Hercegovini = Evidence of the theatre, music, gladiator combats and games from ancient Greece and Rome in archaeology collections in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine, 2017, 314 str. (Adnan Kaljanac).....	225
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Hronika / Chronik

Izveštaj o radu Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja ANUBiH u 2018. godini	227
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

In Memoriam

Orhan Jamaković (1946–2018)	229
-----------------------------------	-----

Adrese autora / Autorenadressen	231
---------------------------------------	-----

Uputstva / Richtlinien / Guidelines

Uputstva za pripremu materijala za Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja ANUBiH.....	233
Richtlinien zur Veröffentlichung im Jahrbuch des Zentrum für Balkanforschungen der AWBH....	235
Guidelines for the article preparation for Godišnjak CBI ANUBiH.....	237

Proceedings of the first PeBA Conference
 Perspectives on Balkan Archaeology – The Early Iron Age: Methods and Approaches

Preface

The idea of **PeBA - Perspectives on Balkan Archaeology** was born in 2015 and choosing Sarajevo as the conference venue for the first PeBA conference seemed the perfect decision. The Conference was held on April 8-9, 2016 in the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina with the 21 participants from Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Croatia, Republic of Macedonia, Germany, Serbia and Slovenia. In the meantime, a second conference took place in Belgrade in 2017 and a third one is scheduled for 2020.

Daniela Heilmann and Marek Verčík, both of whom were members of the Munich Graduate School for Ancient Studies “Distant Worlds” at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University at that time, approached me with the idea to organize an international conference on the Early Iron Age in the Balkan lands. This conference about “The Early Age: Methods and Approaches” was designed to specifically give younger researchers a chance and a forum to introduce their work and discuss their ideas. Aleksandar Jašarević from the Regional Museum of Doboj, Bosnia and Herzegovina, enthusiastically supported the idea and with Mario Gavranović from the Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology (OREA), Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna, the team was complete.

I was very impressed by this initiative and very happy to see, what positive side effects a doctoral dissertation can produce. Daniela Heilmann’s travels to various now independent countries of former Yugoslavia in the course of her efforts to collect information for her doctoral dissertation resulted in contacts with many col-

leagues working on problems of the Early Iron Age in this region. This network of scholarly exchange between Balkan Scholars which transcends state and ideological borders is integral to the concept of PeBA. Of course, those contacts existed before, but sometimes outsiders have a better starting point in creating a new perspective on seemingly familiar matters.

The idea to intensify and to re-establish exchange among researchers of Balkan Archaeology from different countries made Sarajevo an ideal meeting place. As is commonly known, that the city had suffered during the Yugoslav Wars, in the course of which the once famous National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina/ Zemaljski muzej Bosnia i Hercegovina had to close, the collections were stored away and were partly inaccessible for a long time. The enormous symbolic value to come together in Sarajevo, an iconic place evoking the conflicts during the Yugoslav Wars, but also the place of renewal and recovery was obvious to us. All the more so as the city was once a famous centre of Balkan Archaeology - with a long tradition of research starting in the late 19th century and flourishing under the Habsburg Monarchy right into Yugoslav times. I think it was the impression and the feeling of all participants that we were witnessing that something new and promising was about to start. Sarajevo and the vast collections of the National Museum were once a cradle of Balkan Archaeology; thus, the reopening of a small part of the Iron Age collection during the PeBA conference held on the 8th-9th April 2016 was of great importance and a crucial signal to the scientific community. I am writing this from

the outside perspective of a German archaeologist and university professor who sees it as one part of her obligations to teach students that archaeological studies should not be confined by modern national borders and that it is important to reach out and bring together people and ideas from various places and backgrounds.

I will avoid a discussion of what “Balkan Archaeology” actually means at this point, but would rather like to emphasize that many colleagues followed the conference call of the four organizers. Researchers participated with talks or chaired the various sessions. The wide array of topics included research perspectives on the western Balkans with talks about communication networks, settlement structures in a regional perspective or studies concerning aspects of material culture in Bosnia and Herzegovina and beyond. Another session focused on chronological questions of the Early Iron Age in the southern Carpathian Basin, the Slovenian Dolenjsko or the continuity of Iron Age cultural groups in northeastern Serbia. The third session was titled ‘Approaching Identities’ in the Iron Age with contributions on female costumes, theoretical concepts or socioeconomic aspects in areas such as the southeastern Adriatic. A fifth session dealt with ‘Supra-regional Approaches: Communications and Cultural Dynamics’ such as the distribution of weapons in the central Balkan region and surroundings or contacts between southern Pannonia and the northern Balkans. The final session took a regional focus again, examining the burial rights in the Republic of Macedonia, including the contacts to Greece during the Archaic Period, or a case study about burial customs in the contact zone of the Vardar and Bregalnica river valleys.

The large variety of topics offered plenty of opportunities for fruitful discussions. Most im-

pressive was the conference excursion to many famous sites of the Iron Age Glasinac Culture which showed once more that the autopsy of a geographical setting is vital for understanding cultural, in this case archaeological, phenomena.

This first PeBA conference was a big success, from a scholarly as well as - and perhaps even more importantly - from a personal perspective. We owe this experience to many people whom I would like to thank again on behalf of the participants and for myself. Our thanks go to the organizers Daniela Heilmann, Mario Gavranović, Aleksandar Jašarević and Marek Verčík; but also to the colleagues in the NMBiH in Sarajevo, especially Andrijana Pravidur. Our gratitude also goes to the Munich Graduate School for Ancient Studies “Distant Worlds” and the Südosteuropa Gesellschaft Munich which generously granted financial support and thus made the conference possible.

Not all participants found the time to hand in their contributions, mainly because for some time the form in which the conference contributions would be published, was unclear. Thanks to the initiative and financial as well as editorial support offered by my colleague Blagoje Govedarica (Eurasienabteilung, German Archaeological Institute, Berlin and the Centre for Balkan Studies, Academy of Sciences and Arts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo) the proceedings of the first PeBA/Perspectives on Balkan Archaeology conference in Sarajevo held in April 2016 are now presented in this volume of *Godišnjak/Jahrbuch*.

Carola Metzner-Nebelsick
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich

Munich, September 2018

Chronological problems in the continuity of Iron Age cultural groups in Northeastern Serbia

*Aleksandar Kapuran*¹
Belgrade

Abstract: During the last three decades, only four Late Bronze and Iron Age necropolises have been discovered on the territory of Northeastern Serbia. As a result of increased knowledge, there is a certain divergence from the established chronologies. Based on the new findings, this paper aims to point out the existing problems related to the changes in the chronological framework of activities of specific cultural groups.

Key words: Late Bronze Age, Early and Late Iron Age, necropolis, burial rites

Introduction

Changes to chronological classifications are inevitable and reflect the development of archaeology as a science, on the one hand, and the number of new archaeological discoveries, on the other hand. Representative of such chronological adjustments is the situation in the Northeastern Serbia (Map 1). Although ancient historiographers provide direct and indirect testimonies for the end of the Early and the entire Late Iron Ages, in certain cases such accounts create many problems in interpreting the archaeological evidence.² This issue is further amplified by geography, specifically the link between Eastern Serbia and the Danube River valley, which was for millennia in the midst of numerous movements of prehistoric communities between Central to Southeastern Europe.

Every archaeologist studying the Early Iron Age in the territory of the Central Balkans (Serbia, Kosovo and Macedonia) at some point inevitably

faces the problem of differences between the established chronologies and the actual situation on the ground. This problem particularly surfaces when a new necropolis or settlement from the 1st millennium BC is discovered. In Serbian archaeology, several chronological systems of the Iron Age are currently in use. Rastko Vasić is deemed among the foremost experts for the study of this period. He divided the Iron Age in Serbia into following stages:³

- Early Iron Age (Ha B3 – Ha C1: 950/900–800/750 BC)
- Older Iron Age (Phases I – to IV: 800/750–300 BC)
- Younger Iron Age (La Tène: 300 – until the beginning of the 1st century AD).

However, a different division of the Iron Age chronology is used for the purposes of this paper, which deals with the territory of Northeastern Serbia. This chronology is based primarily on M. Garašanin's sequence, as described in his *Prehistory on the territory of Serbia*:⁴

- Iron Age I (Belegiš II – Gava and horizon of hoards: 1200–1000 BC)
- Iron Age II (Insula Banului – Kalakača and Basarabi: 1000–600 BC)

¹Institute of Archaeology, Belgrade

²This is especially related to the testimonies of Herodotus and Thucydides and their use of geographic terms in the territory inhabited by the Triballi, which can be related to various regions in the Central Balkans. Similar can be said for the theories about the origin of Dardanians (see Papazoglu 2004, 47–48; Лазич 2008, 55–56).

³Vasić 1997, 343; Капуран et al. 2014, 74.

⁴Гарашанин 1973, 408; Капуран et al. 2014, 74.

- Iron Age III (Zlot and Ferigile groups: 600–350 BC)
- Iron Age IV (La Tène Culture: 350 BC – 100 AD).

Late Bronze Age / Early Iron Age

Differences in the chronological systems used in classifying prehistoric cultures in Northeastern Serbia emerged in the investigation of necropolises dated to the end of the Late Bronze Age in the territory covering the confluence of the Mlava and Tumanska Rivers with the Danube, the entrance into the hinterland around the Iron Gates, and area of Ključ, located downstream from the Iron Gates before the Wallachian plain. As the number of systematic and rescue excavations increased, it became clear that graves and finds from the Žuto Brdo – Girla Mare and Gava cultures appeared side by side also in the sites the right bank of the Danube River.

Moreover, it has been assumed that the Žuto Brdo – Girla Mare culture emerged on the territory of Serbia during the later phases of the Middle Bronze Age, influenced by Transdanubian incrustrated pottery.⁵ It is interesting that the sites of the Žuto Brdo – Girla Mare culture in Serbia are identified only in Southern Banat, exclusively on the banks of the Danube, while no settlements or burial places have been found in the river's hinterland. According to the current chronologies, the Žuto Brdo – Girla Mare culture lasted until the beginning Late Bronze Age (14/13th century BC) although there are some isolated arguments in favour of its end in the late 12th century BC.⁶ Contrary to the situation with the Žuto Brdo – Girla Mare culture, the Gava culture complex, identified through the presence of the channelled and burnished pottery, is in the Serbian archaeology considered as the trigger of the transition from the Late Bronze to the Early Iron Age. It is, however, important to underline that in several rescue excavations of cremation necropolises discovered in the Serbian part of the Danube River valley and around the Iron Gates the stratigraphic division the two cultures has not been obvious.⁷ In addition to the completely different




Figure 1: Map of sites mentioned in text. 1. Pećine, 2. Veliki Gradac, 3. Konopište, 4. Vajuga, 5. Ljubičevac, 6. Mokranjske Stene, 7. Signal

manner of pottery, the burials of the Gava culture contained a greater number of bronze objects. The relevant sites with finds of both Žuto Brdo – Girla Mare and Gava cultures discussed in this paper are Veliki Gradac, Konopište, Vajuga – Pesak, and Ljubičevac – Selo (Figure 1).

During the rescue excavations connected to the building of Đerdap I power station in the Roman castrum at Veliki Gradac, located in the area where the Paprenica Brook flows into the Danube (around 2 km downstream from Milanovac), three prehistoric graves were discovered (Figure 2). The finds from these graves were documented by a pure chance, during the review of the prehistoric collections in the depot of the Museum of Krajina in Negotin.⁸ Detailed information about the state of these graves could not be obtained from the existing archaeological documentation. However, it could be determined that the finds from Graves 2 (Figure 2, 3–4) and 3 (Figure 2, 5–8) are diagnostic, especially those in Grave 3, in which ceramics typical for the Gava complex and Žuto Brdo – Girla Mare culture appear in the same context. Grave 2 included two finds, both representing characteristic finds of the Gava culture, a miniature biconical vessel decorated with

⁵ Гарашанин 1973, 338; Тасић 1983, 84–85.

⁶ Jevtić / Vukomanović 1996, 287.

⁷ Тасић 1983, 104.

⁸ Булатовић et al. 2013, 82.



Figure 2: Necropolis at Veliki Gradac. 1–2. Grave 1, 3–4. Grave 2, 5–8 Grave 3 (after Bulatović et al. 2013)

horizontal flute on the upper body (Figure 2, 4) and a cup with a highly protruding handle (Figure 2, 3). Grave 3 contained a vessel on a foot decorated with characteristic Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare ornaments (Figure 2, 6), two bowls with inverted rim (Figure 2, 7–8) and a cup with a highly protruding handle (Figure 2, 5). The finds of pottery of different origins and production techniques in a burial point to exchange of objects and techniques between the two groups, which is not an isolated case in the Iron Gates region.

The co-occurrence of the ceramic finds from these two cultures was also noticed in the stratigraphy of the Livade – Mala Vrbica site as well as the necropolis in Konopište (located 9 km east of Kladovo) (Figure 1, 3). During the first phase of archaeological investigations at the prehistoric settlement of Livade in 1980, it was impossible to separate stratigraphically the finds of Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare and Gava cultures in the cultural layers (Figure 3).⁹ During the excavations, however, archaeologists managed to single out finds belonging to the Gava complex inside pit features, most probably belonging to mud huts.¹⁰ In the necropolis located at Konopište, some 200 m southeast of the Livade site, it was also not possible to separate the graves by the means of stratigraphy. It is nonetheless obvious that thirteen graves belonged to the Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare culture while seventeen graves had finds

typical of the Gava complex.¹¹ As the burial pits had originally been cut into a sand terrace and the upper layers of the site were levelled by construction in course of the Roman dominion, it is not possible to detect differences between the levels from which the burials were dug into the substrate. According to the information from the last excavations at the necropolis of Konopište during 2015, it is only clear that graves of Gava culture were dug somewhat deeper than the burials assigned to Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare culture.¹² As the later burials did not disturb the earlier ones, there are only two possibilities: either the supposedly older Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare graves were marked on the surface, or people from both groups were buried simultaneously at the same place.

A similar pattern demonstrating the coexistence of the Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare and Gava elements at the same site are documented at Vajuga – Pesak necropolis, located on the right bank of the Danube downstream from the Iron Gates (Figure 1, 4). This site is important because of its burial continuity, which extends from Bronze Age to the Late Iron Age and Medieval period. The horizon with the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age cremation burials represents the earlier

¹¹ Popović et al. 1988, 82–83.

¹² The information was provided by the custodian Aca Đorđević, the director of research at the site of Konopište, excavated by the National Museum in Belgrade. The report from these excavations is in press.

⁹ Вукмановић / Поповић 1984, 86–87.

¹⁰ Ibid. 12, Fig. 11.




Figure 3: Finds from Livade. 1-5. Žuto Brdo – Gira Mare group, 6-8. Gava style pottery (after Vukmanović / Popović 1986)

phase of the necropolis. The chronological division is based not on the stratigraphy but rather on the stylistic and typological characteristics of grave finds.¹³ According to the excavators of the Vajuga – Pesak necropolis, two burials date to the period of Late Bronze Age or Br D (Žuto Brdo – Gira Mare culture) (Figure 5, 5-10. 11-16), while three remaining graves belong to the Gava culture complex or Ha A period (Figure 5, 1-4. 17-21). In terms of decorative technique of pottery, the typical Žuto Brdo – Gira Mare style (Figure 5, 5-7) started to change from the intensive application of white incrustation to

a polished surface without incrustation (Figure 5, 8-10).¹⁴ Chronologically most important finds are a bronze fibula with a violin bow and burnished pottery, typical for the Gava culture complex (Figure 5, 21).¹⁵

Relatively small-scale excavations near the Ljubičevac village, toward the Selo settlement (2 km downstream from Ljubičevac), were carried out in 1970 by Z. Žeravica, who was the curator of the Museum of Krajina in Negotin at the time (Figure 1, 5).¹⁶ The stratigraphy at the Selo site corresponded mostly to the stratigraphy at the

¹³ Премк et al. 1984, 112-113.

¹⁴ Ibid. 112-113; Jevtić / Vukmanović 1996, 287.

¹⁵ Премк et al. 1984, Fig. 98-100.

¹⁶ Žeravica 1970, 30-31.




Figure 4: Necropolis Konopište – Livade. Gava pottery finds (after Popović 1998)Popović 1986)




Figure 5: Finds from Vajuga – Pesak necropolis. 1–4. Grave 2, 5–10. Grave 3 and 4, 11–16. Grave 5, 17–21. Grave 1 (after Premk et al. 1984)

a

b

c

Figure 6: *Vajuga – Pesak necropolis. a) Distribution of the finds, b) Kalakača finds, c) Basarabi finds (after Popović / Vukmanović 1998)*



a



b




Figure 7: *Signal necropolis. a) Distribution of burials, b) skeletal remains, 1–3. Kalakača pottery, 4–7. bronze finds*




Figure 8: Necropolis Pećine (after Jovanović 1992)

site of Livade.¹⁷ Although the author of the study suggested that the cultural layer was homogeneous and exclusively associated with the Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare culture, after a recent review of the finds in the Museum of Krajina, we discovered that some ceramic vessels from this site are also typical of the Gava culture, spanning the initial phase of the Early Iron Age. Downstream from Ljubičevac, the site of Ušće Slatinske Reke was also excavated. M. Jevtić and M. Vukmanović reported that one pit yielded an unornamented anthropomorphic figurine of Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare type and a lot of incrustated pottery was found together with a larger amount of

channelled and burnished ceramics of the Gava culture.¹⁸

The last example of a close relationship between the Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare and Gava finds is demonstrated in the necropolis of Pećine in the vicinity of Kostolac (Figure 1, 1).¹⁹ The excavator D. Jacanović observed that in all undisturbed contexts (or stratigraphic units) the Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare, Hügelgräber and Gava typical ceramic forms were found together.²⁰ This particularly applies to the four cremated burials with incrustated and burnished pottery found together in same context. A similar mix was documented in 13 pits, most probably dedicated to ritual at this site. These instances caused some archaeologists to classify the last phase of the Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare culture in the territory of the Iron Gates as belonging to the period of Ha A1, which according to chronology of M. Garašanin covers

¹⁷ According to a report from 1970, this site yielded remains of Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare settlement, with remains of burnt houses and with objects still in situ. A later analysis of the archaeological data was done in 2013 by the Museum of Krajina in Negotin by A. Kapuran and A. Bulatović. A considerable amount of finds from the older levels of the Iron Age was found in addition to the finds Žuto Brdo – Grla Mare culture. This pottery was most probably omitted from analysis by the author of excavations (Bulatović et al. 2013, 137–139).

¹⁸ The authors informed me that this material is still unpublished (but see Jevtić / Vukmanović 1996, 286).

¹⁹ Pećine Necropolis consists of burials belonging to the Late Bronze Age, Early La Tène, and Late Antiquity.

²⁰ Јацановић 1991; 1997, 249–250, Pl. I.




Figure 9: *Necropolis Pećine. G 985–987 Burials of domestic communities, G 1201 Celtic Burila* (after Jovanović 1992)

the transitional period between Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages.²¹

Early Iron Age II

In this paper, the Vajuga – Pesak necropolis on the bank of Danube in the Ključ region, located downstream of the Iron Gates (Figure 1, 4),²² is not considered as a case that requires a revision of its Early Iron Age chronology. It is, however, noted here as a specific example of cultural overlapping, which will be demonstrated by the specific case of the Signal necropolis.

The excavators dated the Vajuga – Pesak necropolis between Ha B3 stage, the very end of the Kalakača phase, and the beginning of the Basarabi phase.²³ In this necropolis, the deceases were buried on platforms made of river pebbles. The eastern part contained the oldest burial of the

necropolis (No 17). In its surroundings, several groups of pottery characteristic of the Kalakača phase (Figure 6, b) were discovered, while the rest of the pottery in and around the graves exclusively belonged to the Basarabi complex (Figure 6, c).²⁴ It should be stressed that the all metal finds from these graves have been dated to the Basarabi phase.²⁵ This closely related co-occurrence of two culturally and chronologically different pottery styles correlates with the change in burial rites as there is a shift from flexed inhumation, which prevailed during the Kalakača phase, to inhumation in extended position, characteristic of the Basarabi culture.

Another example of the complex chronological and cultural relations is to observe in the Signal necropolis near Svrlijig in Eastern Serbia (Figure 1, 7).²⁶ The site is situated near the village of Palilula, on a natural terrace by the right bank of the Trstenica River. The necropolis most

²¹ Стојић / Јацановић 2008, 55. 64.

²² Поповић / Вукмановић 1998.

²³ Ibid. 103.

²⁴ Ibid. 81. 104.

²⁵ Ibid. 105.

²⁶ Filipović / Bulatović 2010.




Figure 10: Mokranjske stene. 1–6. Pottery from the grave, 7. Ideal reconstruction of the burial (after Popović / Kapuran 2011)

probably belonged to the nearby hillfort of Oblik, located just above it. Excavations revealed four skeletal burials. The deceased were inhumed and eventually covered with a layer of stones (Figure 6, a–b). Stray finds of jewellery, which were probably grave goods, namely iron bracelets with banded cross-section, have parallels among finds from the necropolis of Vajuga – Pesak (Figure 7, 4, 6–7), belonging to Basarabi phase of 8th and 7th century BC.²⁷ Yet, the ceramic vessels from Signal are characteristic of the Insula Banului and Gornea – Kalakača cultural complexes of Ha B3 stage in the Danube River valley. The *terminus ante quem* in Signal is represented by a double pin with an “M”-shaped head (Figure 7, 5). According to R. Vasić, this type of double pin from

Western and Central Serbia can be dated to the 5th century BC.²⁸ In Signal, therefore, chronologically later metal finds appear together with the considerably earlier ceramics, which could indicate that some small conservative communities retained their burial rituals from the developed stages of the Early Iron Ages (Kalakača phase) until the very end of the Early Iron Age.

Iron Age III/IV

The final phase of the Early Iron Age in the regions south of the Sava and Danube Rivers is represented by the cultural phenomenon defined as Rača – Ljuljaci horizon. Finds from tumuli indicate that the deceased were buried

²⁷ Popović / Vukmanović 1998, 19, Fig. 10, Pl. 4, 8–18.

²⁸ Vasić 2003, 126.

with weapons and a special type of the ceramics goods – cylindrical beakers with a three-leafed foot, a slanted rim, and a single highly elevated banded handle – considered characteristic of the ancient Triballi, with whom the Rača – Ljuljaci culture in Central Serbia is generally associated during 6th/5th centuries BC.²⁹ However, the stratigraphic sequence of the early La Tène phase of the necropolis of Pećine near Kostolac (Figure 8) points to some incompatibilities with the already established chronological and cultural connections. The necropolis dates to the second half of the 4th century BC and has material culture that shows close relationship to the Iron Age communities both in the Central Balkans and in the Pannonian plain.³⁰ In addition, the widespread cremation burials, which are generally connected to the new Celtic populations, a group of burials from Pećine reveals local traits related to the Rača – Ljuljaci culture (Figure 9, 985–987). To mention a few, the pottery shapes include the already-mentioned beakers with a single high handle, a slanted rim and a three-leafed foot, which are believed to have been used in Triballi communities during the 5th century BC.³¹ This also holds true for pins with the double “M” heads (Figure 9, 987). However, as an example from Pećine reveals, the Celtic population was buried together with the local one. The finds from Pećine indicate that the Rača – Ljuljaci horizon certainly lasted up to the end of the 4th century BC, as suggested by finds from the graves attributed to the Celtic population.

The last example of the presence of what have been considered chronologically diverse finds found in the same context in Eastern Serbia also belongs to the La Tène period. A solitary infant burial from the Mokranjske Stene site discovered in the hinterland of the Iron Gates in a vicinity of Negotin must be mentioned. The multi-layered site is located on an elevation surrounded by cliffs on three sides, above the deep canyon of the Sikolska River, just before the section where it flows into Timok River. From here, it is possible to control communication routes that lead through the Timok River valley to its confluence

with the Danube as well as those through the Wallachian plain to the east.

This burial was found unexpectedly in 2011 inside of a test trench (Figure 10, 7).³² Inside the grave, an unusual burial custom of the Late La Tène communities in this region was noted. In the northern part of the burial pit, skeletal remains of a 1.5 year old infant were covered with a single large amphora fragment and one misshaped turned fructiera, typical of the late La Tène pottery (Figure 10, 3, 7). In the southern part of the grave fragments of one complete and one ritually broken vessel were found together (Figure 10, 1–2, 4–5). It was somewhat surprising to see that this ceramic ensemble was composed of pottery bearing characteristics of the latest phases of the La Tène period in Pannonia and the Danube basin (Figure 10, 3–5) and of pottery typical of local communities a few centuries earlier, at the end of Early Iron Age (Iron Age III), (Figure 10, 1–2). It is important to underline that the amphora fragment (Figure 10, 2) shows obvious similarities with the finds from the necropolis Ferigile in Oltenia where such vessels have been found whole as a part of pottery spectrum until 2nd century BC.³³

Conclusion

At the end, we can conclude that outlined examples demonstrate how the established chronologies of the Early Iron Age in Northeastern Serbia, which are based on stylistic-typological identification of finds, require certain corrections in light of the latest discoveries. These adjustments should also be considered from an extended geographical point of view, especially considering that this region situated between from Central Europe to the Mediterranean had experienced different cultural shifts. Certain discrepancies in stylistic and typological characteristics of finds from burial contexts are the most vivid example how some older traditions obviously remain to exist as a part of the ritual practice of following Iron Age customs. With respect to Northeastern Serbia and the specific cultural manifestation in this part of the Balkan Peninsula, following conclusions can be made.

²⁹ Срејовић 1991, 149; Jevtić 1983.

³⁰ Jovanović 1987; 1992, 87; 2010, 164; Sladić 1998.

³¹ Jevtić 1983, 38. 42–43.

³² Popović / Kapuran 2011, 297.

³³ Ibid. 301.

First, the span of the Žuto Brdo – Gira Mare culture which, according to the established chronologies, disappears during the Late Bronze Age (Br D),³⁴ should be broadened to include the Ha A stage or the time of the 12th century BC, as proposed by M. Jevtić and M. Vukmanović,³⁵ and as previously indicated by M. Garašanin.³⁶ The publication of the mentioned unornamented figurines from the site of Ušće Slatinske reke, which remain unavailable to the scientific public despite having been excavated five decades ago, would doubtlessly help in presenting a clearer argument in favour of the certain chronological overlap of incusted and burnished pottery. Moreover, the publication of the finds would also clarify the mutual relationships between groups with richly ornamented incusted pottery (Žuto Brdo – Gira Mare) and groups with burnished, channelled pottery (Gava cultural complex). One can assume that the mentioned examples from the sites of Livade, Konopište, Vajuga – Pesak, Selo, and Pećine also present evidence in support of this hypothesis.

Second, in course of the developed Iron Age or Iron Age II in the territory of Serbia, only a small number of inhumation burials has been discovered. The burials suggest the transition from cremation of the deceased, characteristic for the Late Bronze Age (Belegiš I, Žuto Brdo – Gira Mare cultures) and the following Gava cultural complex. In the subsequent Kalakača phase (9th/8th century BC),³⁷ inhumation burials prevail, most often with the deceased resting on the side, with grave goods comprising whole or ritually broken vessels (for example, at Pećine near Vrdnik, Jaša Tomić and Asfaltna baza in Zemun),³⁸ while at some other necropolises grave goods of iron artefacts occur (for example, at Mojsinje near Čačak, Mound V, Grave 4).³⁹ Two collective (mass) burials at the site of Gomolava I and II are not common custom and can be described as an exception caused by extraordinary circumstances.⁴⁰ However, a newly discovered graves of the the Kalakača phase from Mound V from the

necropolis of Mojsinje, point to certain changes of burial tradition. The deceased now begin to be placed in extended position lying on their back, with arms parallel to the body.⁴¹ The most significant find from this necropolis is a double-looped iron fibula from Grave 4, the oldest fibula of this type in Serbia, which R. Vasić dated to 9th/8th centuries BC.⁴² The Early Iron Age necropolis at Mojsinje also represents the hallmark of changing burial rites, which took place during the temporal span of the Vajuga – Pesak necropolis, at the very transition to the Basarabi horizon (ca. 800 BC). Skeletal burials at Vajuga – Pesak site are all also in extended position on back and dated between 775–725 BC.⁴³ Judging by the pottery and some jewellery (e.g., fibulae with a foot in shape of hourglass),⁴⁴ this necropolis can be assigned to the early stage of Basarabi culture. Another important change are the iron objects that appear in much greater numbers. If we take into account the similar phenomenon at Mojsinje, we can assume that the appearance of the precious new metal – iron – and new burial rite are closely connected. It is thus obvious that the introduction of the iron is related to the contacts with Basarabi culture. The close relationship of previous Kalakača phase and following Basarabi horizon is attested also in the eastern part of Vajuga – Pesak site where pottery characteristic of both groups was clearly intermixed. P. Popović and M. Vukmanović were right to suggest that these finds do not change the precise chronological dating of the Vajuga – Pesak necropolis,⁴⁵ but, as previously suggested, rather expose the strong influence of the preceding, older local traditions.

Third, in case of the Signal necropolis, located deep inside the mountainous region of Eastern Serbia near the town of Svrlijig, there is a pronounced paucity of grave goods (although the same graves are tied to the stray finds of iron bracelets), but the tradition of older cultural traditions persisting can also be observed. Specifically, the deceased were positioned in an extended position on their back, but their arms were crossed on their chest, as it is also the case of Graves 1, 5 and 6 at the site of Sutbarlija assigned

³⁴ Garašanin 1973, 349; Tasić 1983, 85; Крстић 2003, 118.

³⁵ Jevtić / Vukmanović 1996, 290.

³⁶ Garašanin 1983, 522.

³⁷ Medović / Medović 2011, 272.

³⁸ Медовић 1984–1985, 5, 8; 1999; Поповић 2010, 223–231.

³⁹ Никитовић et al. 2002, Tab, 3, 1.

⁴⁰ Tasić 1972.

⁴¹ Никитовић et al. 2002, 51–52, Fig. 21.

⁴² Vasić 2014, 207.

⁴³ Popović / Vukmanović 1998, 106.

⁴⁴ Vasić 1999, 55–56; Popović / Vukmanović 1998.

⁴⁵ Popović / Vukmanović 1998, 106.

to the Srem group of the Early Iron Age,⁴⁶ which P. Medović has dated to Phase IIIa of the Bosut culture (500–250 BC).⁴⁷ One further example of the grave from the final stage of Iron Age II (7th–6th century BC) comes from Moštanica near the town of Vranje in southern Serbia.⁴⁸ According to the author of the study, M. Jovanović, the interred deceased was put on his/her back and held an iron spear point in one hand on his/her chest. The grave contained also an iron fibula.⁴⁹ The pottery finds in Grave 4 from the Signal necropolis were modest goods of vessels, most probably ritually broken, with characteristics of the Pšeničevo – Babadag and the Insula Banului groups, and the Kalakača horizon.⁵⁰ There was also an iron pin with a, “M”-shaped head, which has been dated to the 6th century BC. Because of this combination of finds, the Signal necropolis should gain importance, as great caution is needed when defining absolute and relative chronologies of the Early Iron Age sites in the Central Balkans. The following dilemma remains. Should the span of the Kalakača phase in these remote regions be extended to the end of 7th and start of 6th centuries BC or are we simply dealing with more conservative societies in a mountainous area that retain certain cultural traditions even after these traditions disappear in areas along the main communication routes?

And finally, the case of the chronological discontinuity at the Early La Tène necropolis of Pećine points to a need to change the lower chronological boundary of the Rača – Ljuljaci group from the Early Iron Age (Iron Age III) to the end of 4th century BC. Burials with local indigenous characteristics at Pećine can be dated rather precisely by the finds from the contemporary Celtic graves. With regards to the burial rites, it would be an oversimplification to state that indigenous populations influenced their Celtic allies, as both communities practiced cremations and inhumations. Contrary to the situation at Pećine, a completely different arrangement can be observed in a child burial from the rock shelter of Mokranjske stene, dated to the

2nd century BC.⁵¹ This particular example shows that funeral traditions are at times difficult to change and that the desire to distinguish individual identity is sometimes stronger than the actual technological and socio-economic changes of the society (or way of life), brought along with the emergence of the ancient Scordisci. The importance of this find is also suggested by the observation that from this period onward there are almost no burials that can be clearly assigned to the indigenous societies (the Triballi, Dardarians or Autariates). Child graves, furthermore, are exceptionally rare. The grave from Mokranje shows that in addition to the prevailing custom of cremation, a part of the indigenous society still practiced inhumation in graves supplemented by goods of pottery that demonstrated the strong traditional elements characteristics of late phase of the Early Iron Age.

Na engleski jezik preveo Stefan Milošević

Rezime

Hronološki problemi u kontinuitetu kulturnih grupa gvozdenog doba u severoistočnoj Srbiji

Arheolog koji se bavi gvozdenim dobom na području centralnog Balkana morao se suočiti sa određenim odstupanjima na relaciji postojećih hronoloških sistema i situacije na terenu. Problem se naročito aktualizuje u momentu kada dođe do otkrića neke nove nekropole ili naselja sa kraja II i u I milenijumu pre n. e. Mada se za kraj starijeg i celokupno mlađe gvozdeno doba mogu naći posredna i neposredna svedočenja antičkih istoriografa, čini se da nam ona u nekim slučajevima više odmažu nego pomažu da tumačimo arheološke zapise. Promene u hronološkim sistemima su neminovane proces i u skladu su sa razvojem arheologije kao nauke sa jedne i količine novih arheoloških otkrića sa druge strane. Ovo se vidi i na primeru kontinuiteta kultura gvozdenog doba severoistočne Srbije. Problem produbljuje i geografska povezanost istočne Srbije sa Podunavljem, koje se tokom milenijuma nalazilo na udaru pomeranja praistorijskih zajednica od centralne do jugoistočne Evrope.

⁵¹ Popović / Kapuran 2011, 301.

⁴⁶ Medović 2007, 10–11. 16–19.

⁴⁷ Medović / Medović 2011, 272.

⁴⁸ Jovanović 1969, 72–74; Булатовић 2007, 104–108.

⁴⁹ Jovanović 1969, 73.

⁵⁰ Filipović / Bulatović 2010, 77.

Prvi slučaj koji izaziva određene nedoumice predstavljaju istraživanja lokaliteta i nekropola sa prelaza iz bronzanog u gvozdeno doba na ušću Mlave u Dunav, Velikog Gradca, Konopišta, Male Vrbice, Pesak – Korbovo i Ljubičevac selo u Đerdapu i nizvodno od njega. U ovim slučajevima radi se o prisustvu nalaza kultura Žuto Brdo – Girla Mare zajedno sa nalazima Gava kulturnog kompleksa u istom kontekstu. Sledeću hronološku nedoslednost pokazuje zajedničko prisustvo hronološki starijih elemenata Kalakača i elemenata Basarabi, kao hronološki mlađe keramike, u kontekstu grobova na nekropoli Vajuga – Pesak kod Korbova. Slična je situacija zatečena na nekropoli Signal kod Svrlijiga, gde je u skeletno sahranjenim grobovima otkrivena keramika tipa Kalakača zajedno sa hronološki dosta mlađim bronzanim iglama sa “M” glavom. Tokom VI–V veka pre n. e. na tribalskoj nekropoli Ljuljaci otkriveni su gotovo identični pogrebni prilozi kao i u ranolatenskoj nekropoli Pečine, koja je precizno datovana u sredinu IV veka pre n. e. Poslednji primer hronoloških neslaganja predstavljao bi grob jednog deteta iz Moranja kod Negotina. Zajedno sa keramikom karakterističnom za mlađu fazu latenske kulture u Srpskom podunavlju, javljaju se keramički oblici koji imaju karakteristike starosedelačkih zajednica sa kraja starijeg gvozdenog doba ili Ha C.

Kao zaključak izlaganja treba napomenuti da navedeni primeri pokazuju kako postojeće stilsko-tipološke i hronološke determinacije kultura gvozdenog doba u severoistočnoj Srbiji zahtevaju izvesne korekcije i prilagođavanja na koja ukazuju nova otkrića. Ove korekcije treba sagledati ne samo hronološki već i u okviru geografskih celina koje pokazuju različitosti u kulturnim kretanjima od centralne Evrope do Mediterana.

Bibliography

- Булатовић, А. 2007, Врање, Културна стратиграфија праисторијских локалитета у Врањској регији, Археолошка грађа Србије III, Београд – Врање 2007.
- Булатовић, А. / Капуран, А. / Јањић, Г. 2013, Неготин, културна стратиграфија праисторијских локалитета у Неготинској Крајини, Археолошка грађа Србије VIII, Београд – Неготин 2013.
- Вукмановић, М. / Поповић, П. 1984, Ливаде, Мала Врбица, извештај о сондажним ископавањима у 1980. години, Ђердапске свеске II, Београд 1984, 85–91.
- Гарашанин, М. 1973, Праисторија на тлу СР Србије, Српска књижевна задруга, Београд 1973.
- Гарашанин, М. 1983, Dubovačko-Žutobrdska grupa, In: Benac, A. (ed.), Praistorija jugoslovenskih zemalja IV, Bronzano doba, Sarajevo 1983, 520–535.
- Filipović, V. / Bulatović, A. 2010, An Early Iron Age necropolis in Eastern Serbia, Гласник Српског археолошког друштва 26, Београд 2010, 73–83.
- Јацановић, Д. 1991, Нове статуете Дубовачко-Жутобрдске културе и прилог тумачењу статуета као божанства смрти, Viminacium 6, Београд 1991, 5–30.
- Јацановић, Д. 1997, Нови прилози о касном бронзаном и раном гвозденом добу у Браничеву, In: Лазић, М. (ed.) Археологија источне Србије, Београд 1997, 249–258.
- Јевтић, М. 1983, Керамика старијег гvozdenog doba на centralnom balkanskom području, Centar za arheološka istraživanja, Beograd 1983.
- Јевтић, М. / Vukmanović, М. 1996, Late Bronze and Early Iron Age in the Danube valley from V. Gradište down to Prahovo, In: Tasić, N. (ed.), The Yugoslav Danube Basin and the neighbouring regions in the 2nd millennium B. C., Belgrade – Vršac 1996, 283–293.
- Јовановић, М. 1969, Slanište, Moštanica, Vranje – nekropola gvozdenog doba, Arheološki pregled 11, Beograd 1969, 72–74.
- Јовановић, В. 1987, Istočna grupa, Keltska kultura u Jugoslaviji, In: Benac, A. (ed.), Praistorija jugoslovenskih zemalja V, Svjetlost i ANUBIH, Sarajevo 1987, 815–854.
- Јовановић, В. 1992, Dolazak Kelta na Balkan, In: Tasić, N. (ed.), Skordisci and the native population in the middle Danube region, Balkanološki institut, Posebna izdanja 48, Beograd 1992, 83–94.
- Јовановић, В. 2010, Походи Источних Келта на Хеленистичку Грчку и Малу Азију, Глас Српске академије наука и уметности CDXIV, Београд 2010, 161–172.
- Капуран, А. / Булатовић, А. / Јовановић, И. 2014, Бор, културна стратиграфија праисторијских локалитета између Ђердапа и Црног Тимока, Археолошка грађа у Србији IX, Београд – Бор 2014.
- Крстић, Д. 2003, Гламија, некропола бронзаног доба у Крбову, Народни музеј у Београду, Београд 2003.
- Лазић, М. 1985, Ко су били Дарданци?, In: Лазић, М. (ed.) Архаика 2/2008, Београд 2009, 53–76.
- Медовић, П. 1984, Скелетни гроб старијег гvozdenog doba са локалитета Пећине у Врднику, Рад војвођанских музеја 29, Нови Сад 1984–1985, 5–8.
- Medović, P. 1999, Skelettgrab der frühen Eisenzeit bei der Siedlung Jaša Tomić (Banat), Старинар XLXI/1998, Београд 1999, 39–48.

- Medović, P.* 2007, Stubarlija, nekropola naselja Feudvar, Muzej Vojvodine, Novi Sad 2007.
- Medović, P. / Medović, I.* 2011, Gradina na Bosutu, naselje starijeg gvozdenog doba, Herausgreber, Pokrajinski zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture i Platoneum d. o. o., Novi Sad 2011.
- Никитовић, Л. / Стојић, М. / Васић, Р. 2002, Мојсиње, некропола под хумкама из бронзаног и гвозденог доба, Народни музеј Чачак, Чачак 2002.
- Papazoglu, F.* 2004, Srednjobalkanska plemena u predrimsko doba, Equilibrium, Beograd 2004.
- Поповић, Б. 2010, Асфалтна база у Земуну, Насеље старијег гвозденог доба, Музеј града Београда, Београд 2010.
- Popović, P.* 1998, Problem of cult features in the Late Bronze Age cemetery at Konopište, In: Shuster, C. (ed.), Die Kulturen der bronzezeit in dem Gebiet des Eisernen Tores Kolloquium in Dobreta – Turnu Severin (November 1997), Rumänisch-Jugoslawische Kommission für die Erforschung der Region des Eisernen Tores, Archäologische Abteilung 2, Bukarest 1998, 147–153.
- Popović, P. / Kapuran, A.* 2011, La Tombe de Mokranje, In: Magureanu, D. et al. (eds.) Archaeology: making of and practice, Studies in honor of Mircea Babes at his 70th anniversary, Pitesti 2011, 297–304.
- Popović, P. / Vukmanović, M.* 1998, Vajuga – Pesak, nekropola starijeg gvozdenog doba, Arheološki institut, Beograd 1998.
- Popović, P. / Vukmanović, M. / Radojčić, N.* 1988, Mala Vrbica / Konopište, Praistorijske i srednjovekovna nekropola i antička arhitektura, Arheološki pregled 29, Beograd 1988, 82–83.
- Премк, А. / Поповић, П. / Бјелајац, Љ. 1984, Вајуга – Песак, извештај о сондажним ископавањима у 1980. години, Ђердапске свеске II, Београд 1984, 111–124.
- Срејовић, Д. 1991, Трибалски гробови у Љуљацима, Старинар XL–XLI, Београд 1991, 141–153.
- Стојић, М. / Јаџановић, Д. 2008, Пожаревац, културна стратиграфија праисторијских локалитета у Браничеву, Археолошка грађа Србије IV, Београд – Пожаревац 2008.
- Tasić, N.* 1972, An Early Iron Age collective tomb at Gomolava, Archaeologia Jugoslavica XIII, Beograd 1972, 27–38.
- Тасић, Н. 1983, Југословенско подунавље од Индоевропске сеобе до продора Скита, Матица Српска и Балканолошки институт САНУ, Нови Сад – Београд 1983.
- Vasić, R.* 1997, Gvozdeno doba, In: Srejić, D. (ed.), Arheološki leksikon, Savremena administracija, Beograd 1997, 342–343.
- Vasić, R.* 1999, Die Fibeln in Zentralbalkan, Prähistorische Bronzefunde Abteilung XIV, 12. Band, Stuttgart 1999.
- Vasić, R.* 2003, Die Nadeln im Zentralbalkan, Prähistorische Bronzefunde XIII, Band 11, Stuttgart 2003.
- Vasić, R.* 2014, Ein Nachtrag zu den PBF-Bänden; Die den Zentralbalkan Betreffend, Старинар LXIV, Београд 2014, 205–217.
- Vukomanović, M. / Popović, P.* 1986, Recherches archéologiques sur la localité “Livade” près Mala Vrbica, Ђердапске свеске III, Београд 1986, 7–26.
- Sladić, M.* 1998, Mlađe gvozdeno doba na teritoriji Srbije, Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Žeravica, Z.* 1970, Selo Ljubičevac – naselje bronzanog doba, Arheološki pregled 12, Beograd 1970, 30–31.

Godišnjak izlazi od 1957. godine. Prva (I) i druga sveska (II-1961) štampane su u izdanju Balkanološkog instituta Naučnog društva BiH, a od 1965. (III/1) izdavač časopisa je Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja ANUBiH. Počev od sveske XXXIX/37 numeracija je svedena na prvu cifru koja se izražava arapskim brojem. Objavljeni radovi su vrednovani od strane međunarodne redakcije i recenzenata.

Das Jahrbuch erscheint seit dem Jahr 1957. Der erste (I) und zweite Band (II-1961) wurden im Balkanologischen Institut der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft B-H herausgegeben. Seit dem Band III/1, 1965 erscheint die Zeitschrift im Zentrum für Balkanforschungen der AWK B-H. Ab Band XXXIX/37 wird die Nummerierung auf die erste, folglich arabisch ausgedrückter Zahl, zurückgezogen. Die veröffentlichten Artikel wurden von der internationalen Redaktion und Rezensenten begutachtet.

* * *

Naslovna strana / Titelblatt
Dževad Hozo

Ilustracija na naslovnoj strani / Illustration am Titelblatt
Amblem PeBA konferencije / Emblem der PeBA Konferenz

Adresa redakcije / Redaktionsadresse
cbi-anubih@anubih.ba

Web izdanje / Web-Ausgabe
www.anubih.ba/godisnjak

Sekretarka Redakcije / Sekretärin der Redaktion
Sabina Vejzagić

Lektura / Lektorin
Zenaida Karavdić

Tehnički urednik / Technische Redakteur
Narcis Pozderac

DTP
Narcis Pozderac

Tiraž / Auflage
500

Štampa / Druck
Dobra knjiga, Sarajevo

Časopis je indeksiran u / Zeitschrift verzeichnet in
C.E.E.O.L. (Central Eastern European Online Library)
Ebsco Publishing
Ulrich Periodicals
ZENON DAI (Journals Database of German Archaeological Institute)
Cross Ref