

UDC 930.85 (4—12)

YU ISSN 0350—7653

ACADEMIE SERBE DES SCIENCES ET DES ARTS

INSTITUT DES ETUDES BALKANIQUES

BALCANICA

ANNUAIRE DE L'INSTITUT DES ETUDES BALKANIQUES

XXV-1



BELGRADE

1994



Aleksandar PALAVESTRA
Institute for Balkan Studies
Belgrade

BALKANOLOGY, ARCHAEOLOGY AND LONG-TERM HISTORY

Abstract: The paper deals with the theoretical and methodological correlation between archaeology, Braudel's structural history and Balkanology. The common denominator and the link between these disciplines is Cvijić's anthropogeographical school, and his cultural models, which were the core of the hypothetical and paradigmatic cultural models of Balkan prehistory, confirmed in a number of archaeological projects of the Institute for Balkan Studies.

During the late sixties, the need to overcome the traditionalist, "culture-historical" way of explaining the phenomena in the past resulted in a serious crisis of archaeology. The traditional archaeology was then criticized among the young, mainly Anglo-Saxon archaeologists, for it was descriptive and offered more or less uniform interpretations of archaeological material, reduced to defining cultures, influences, migrations and possible cultural diffusion. This criticism of the "traditionalist" archaeology, mainly justified, pointed to the fact that some of the commonly accepted archaeological conceptions of the time had to be reconsidered, and that some of the basic notions in use in archaeological literature, such as culture, migration or cultural influences, should undergo a thorough revision of meaning and adapt to the new theoretical and methodological framework. These were the foundations of the *New Archaeology*, which stressed the need for the new explanations of the past and the new archaeological concept. The aim was to relate the discipline to the natural sciences and to establish universal scientific laws present in human society, analogous with the laws of nature. The basic concept of the *New Archaeology* has been re-

cently summarized and compared to the traditional archaeological system by Colin Renfrew and Paul Bahn.¹ According to the authors, the objective of the *New Archaeology* was an explanation instead of a description, a study of cultural processes instead of cultural history, and, in theoretical-methodological aspects, an aspiration towards generalization - deductive instead of inductive method, formulating hypotheses and models, as well as their testing. For its orientation towards cultural processes, this archaeology is also called *processual archaeology*, or *functionalist-processual*, for its association with the functionalist school of anthropologists.

However, the aspiration towards generalization and formulation of "laws", based upon the philosophy of science of the American philosopher Carl Hempel, did not succeed in solving the basic problems of archaeological interpretation.² Instead of widening the research field, the new archaeology often dwelled upon marginal issues and unpurposeful methodological purity, thus creating the "archaeology of law and order", as ironically put by Kent Flannery.³ Historiography, somewhat earlier than archaeology, got over the influence of Hempel's hypothetical-deductive methods and universal laws, which have proven not to be applicable in this field of research either and were severely criticized.⁴ Anthropologists, from their standpoint, inspired by their research experience, also pointed to the possible dangers of the belated functionalism in archaeology,⁵ but - as is often the case - the experience of others rarely proves to be instructive, so archaeology had to fight its own way through the crisis and the misconceptions of the new theoretical view. Anyhow, the theoretical dilemma and the need to search for the new pathways in archaeology proved to be very productive, and the *New Archaeology* moved things forward, being the generator of the creation of a wide range of new concepts in archaeology, some of them stemming from the *New Archaeology* itself, while the others originated as the opposition to its ideas. Some archaeologists have sought for the new theoretical premise in the Marxist or neo-Marxist school, the others in structuralism, and yet others in the "historical idealism", thus creating the *post-processual* alternative.⁶

Contextual or *post-processual* archaeology, as defined by Ian Hodder, associated archaeology with history after a long pause. The main support is found in the historical idealism of the English historian R.G. Collingwood. In his allegiance of archaeology to history, Hodder realized and stressed the importance of the "long-term his-

1 C. Renfrew, P. Bahn, 1991, 35.

2 B. Trigger, 1989, 329-340; M. Стевановић, 1990, 185-200.

3 K. Flannery, 1973, 51.

4 W. Dray, 1969, 106-124; M. Mandelbaum, 1969, 124-140; R. Weingartner, 1969, 140-157.

5 E. Leach, 1973, 761-771.

6 I. Hodder, 1986, 77-169.

tory" and the French historiographic school of *Annales*, where the idea was conceived.⁷

The concept of "total history" - including the "long-term history" - developed by the French historiographic school of *Annales* (*Annales d'histoire économique et sociale*) was bound to influence archaeology which also aspires to study "total" past. The school of *Annales* was formed, although under a different name, in the late twenties by the works of Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch. They provided the outlines of the new "total" history, heavily influenced by the philosophy and sociology of Emile Durkheim and the geography of Paul Vidal de la Blache and his journal *Annales de géographie*, as well as the ideas of the new historical synthesis developed by Henri Berr. The term "total history" encompasses a range of phenomena much wider than the everyday political history and forms a synthesis of different geographical, social, economic, psychological elements of the past. Synthetic and interdisciplinary approach has enabled the *Annalists* to consider the "totality" of lives of people in the past and to take a different attitude towards "events" in history, now envisaged in connection to the wider historical motions, conditioned by collective psychology (mentality), geographical setting, industry and society.⁸

Fernand Braudel further developed this intercourse of social, economic and geographic conditions with history in his famous work *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* (1949).⁹ The ideas of the French *Annalists* have become widely popular due to this renowned book, whose main character is not the mighty Spanish king of the XVI century, but the Mediterranean itself, the lands around it and the people who have lived on its shores. It may well be said that Braudel, although the most famous among the *Annalists*, belongs to the second generation, after Febvre and Bloch, and before Jacques Le Goff and Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, who have continued the prolific activity of the school. Fernand Braudel conceived and studied history in three distinct planes. The first plane is the "long-term" history: "The static history of man envisaged through the relations to his environment; this history evolves slowly and very often includes persistent retrogressions, the everlasting circles, always beginning anew".¹⁰ This history of the slow rhythm, or long-term history, is not a simple geographical setting of historical events, but includes cultural and historical dimensions and synthesis of geographical and natural elements as well. It encompasses geology, climatology and geomorphology and, on the other hand, demographic movements, agriculture, commerce, trade routes, crafts etc. The other plane of Braudel's study is the middle-term history: "social history,

7 I. Hodder, 1987, 1-8.

8 А. Митрович, 1992, 371-376.

9 F. Braudel, 1990.

10 Ф. Бродел, 1992, 45.

history of groups and populations".¹¹ This social history of "groups and populations" shows social and economic structures formed under the influence of natural conditions, demographic and economic changes, slow but visible changes in mentality and attitudes of societies, states and civilizations. According to Braudel, these depersonalized, collective, but dated forces, as denoted by Febvre,¹² reflect the waves from the depths, that influence the entire life. Among these forces coming from the depths, acting upon groups and between groups, Braudel identified the most important factors (conjunctures), such as growth and decline of population, market supply and demand, increase and decrease of prices, technological and geographical discoveries, the appearance of new commodities, and the impact of these factors upon the totality of a society, way of life and historical motions. Historical events, immediate political history and the persons shaping it form the third historical plane of Braudel's system, and his third historical time: "short-term history". "The traditional history, the history according to the perception of an individual... history of events...the vibrant surface of history, the waves caused by forceful tides. This is the history replete of short, quick, forceful oscillations".¹³ Braudel described these events as sparkles lighted up only when all the necessary conditions are fulfilled, not sooner or later. All the three planes make up the "total history", although in the later works of Braudel the stress is put on the long-term history of the slow rhythm, i.e. on the questions of demography, economy and psychology that shape the history.

The focus of Braudel's research, as, for that matter, of all the *Annalists*, is on structure, not process.¹⁴ Therefore, it does not come as a surprise that the paradigm of *Annales* appeared in archaeology precisely in the moment where the alternative models for challenging processual archaeology were sought for. The school of *Annales* offered to archaeologists a new angle, hitherto neglected by the theoretical models, the one pointed towards continuity, not towards discontinuity and changes. The traditional culture-historical model paid attention to culture changes and explained them mainly in terms of migrations and influences; the processual archaeology was concerned with adaptive and systemic changes, and the Marxist and neo-Marxist archaeology with changes derived from social controversies and hidden ideology. As opposed to these approaches based upon the study of changes, the long-term history demonstrated that it is possible, even in archaeology, to focus upon continuity and perennial structures in the past.¹⁵ In Ian Hodder's book *Reading the Past* (1986) the importance of long-term history is pointed out, but more attention is

11 Ф. Бродел, 1992, 46.

12 J. Vintiliff, 1991, 7.

13 Ф. Бродел, 1992, 46.

14 А. Митровић, 1992, 381.

15 I. Hodder, 1986, 80.

paid to Collingwood's "historical idealism" and to the search for the ideas of social and symbolic context in the past. However, a year later Hodder edited the book *Archaeology as Long-Term History* (1987), where the importance of the school of *Annales* and Braudel's work is fully acknowledged, first of all in Hodder's introductory paper.¹⁶ Furthermore, Braudel's model entered archaeology due to the *center-periphery* concept, designed to explain culture contacts and trade, particularly on long distances. The archaeological concept of *center-periphery* is based upon the ideas of the historian Emmanuel Wallerstein, whose works, as well as Braudel's, treat the history of the XVI and XVII centuries. The *center-periphery* concept involves a large economic system ("world system"), comprising several cultures, with its center and periphery being economically and culturally interrelated.¹⁷ Braudel's idea of mutual dependence of economic and social structures in the Mediterranean and their slow change, influenced deeply the theoretical concept of center-periphery.¹⁸ His model of complex Mediterranean economic and social structure was even used as an analogy for commercial and social relations between the Celtic Europe and the Mediterranean in the late Hallstatt period.¹⁹ The importance of the school of *Annales* for archaeology is further pointed out in the publication *The Annales School and Archaeology* (1991), where the editor and the author of the introductory essay, John Bintliff, strongly stresses Braudel's argument that the whole human activity is aimed primarily at communicating through time and at maintaining or enlarging its area. Bintliff considers this Braudel's model of communication especially important for archaeologists, due to the fact that the objective of any archaeological research is principally the attempt to understand, that is to communicate with the makers of the material remains of the past.²⁰

The archaeology in Yugoslavia has not been in the epicenter of the methodological dispute over the last twenty years. Strongly attached to the traditionalist archaeology and the methodological concept of the German archaeological school, Yugoslav archaeology tentatively and gradually accepted the essence of the new theoretical breakthroughs and the main results of the *New Archaeology*. The more elusive methodological arguments and researches in American and West-European archaeology - that sometimes traced the new routes of research and fresh angles of observation and interpretation, but sometimes also resulted in fashionable, but vain methodological attempts - left no visible impact upon Yugoslav archaeology. However, some archaeologists from these parts showed affinity for connecting their research to other related disciplines, above all history and eth-

16 I. Hodder, 1987.

17 M. Rowlands, 1987; T. Champion, 1989.

18 M. Rowlands 1987.

19 P. Brun, 1994.

20 J. Bintliff, 1991, 13.

nology. This trend is most noticeable in the archaeological researches dealing with Balkanology, thus approaching the Yugoslav archaeology to the new theoretical concepts of the European archaeology, first of all to the one based upon the concept of "long-term" history. This theoretical trend of a part of the Yugoslav archaeology, stemming from the interdisciplinary character of Balkanology itself, has not been methodologically explicated so far.

Balkanology is an interdisciplinary research field, dealing with the Balkan Peninsula as a distinct cultural, historical, linguistic and geopolitical entity. Developed by the end of the XIX century, initially oriented towards linguistic research, synchronic and diachronic comparative analyses of the Balkan languages, Balkanology expanded its field of research to the questions of history, ethnography, literature, history of art of the Balkan peoples. Archaeological research forms an essential part of thus formulated comparative study of Balkanology and is particularly present in the Yugoslav Balkanology. The Institute for Balkan Studies of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Belgrade, as well as the former Center for the Balkanological Research of the Academy of Sciences and Arts of Bosnia-Herzegovina in Sarajevo, are among the rare Balkanological institutions paying the due attention to the archaeological component of the research of the Balkans. This wide research concept of the Yugoslav Balkanology is the result of the fact that it is based upon the tradition of Serbian historiography and ethnography, as well as upon the principles of the anthropogeographical school of Jovan Cvijić.

As early as the end of the XIX century, the great Serbian historian and statesman Stojan Novaković (1847-1915) confronted the prevailing methodological concept of the time by arguing for the interdisciplinary approach to history, involving history itself, history of law, ethnography, geography and economy. Novaković applied this interdisciplinary, Balkanological approach in writing his study *Selo (Village)*, planned as a part of the larger project *Narod i zemlja u staroj srpskoj državi (People and Land of the Old Serbian State)*. At the time when only the historical sources contemporaneous to the events described were acknowledged as scientifically valid, he was criticized for exercising "historical ethnography".²¹ The modern historiography highly appraises the methodological approach of Novaković, stressing his successful comprehension of the "long-term" historical phenomena that enabled him to form the integral picture of the Balkan history.²² The later generations of historians, from Konstantin Jireček, Jovan Radonjić, Vasa Čubrilović, Jorjo Tadić, Aleksa Ivić, to Radovan Samardžić and many more younger scholars, have followed this Balkanological orientation founded by Novaković, that has given grounds to archaeologists to pay attention to the "long-term" phenomena. It is

21 V. Jagić, 1893, 108-117.

22 С. Біркович, 1963, 10-11; Р. Самарцић, 1966, 24-26.

noteworthy that most of these historians, as well as some of their disciples, based their work upon the researches in the Archive of Dubrovnik, the very same institution that has enabled Braudel to envisage more clearly the "long-term history" of the Mediterranean: "I still vividly remember the exhilaration felt when, in 1934, I discovered in Dubrovnik the miraculous documents from Ragusa: at last, they spoke of ships, leases, merchandise, insurance, trade... For the first time, the Mediterranean of the XVI century was before my eyes."²³ Some of these historians-Balkanologists, such as Radovan Samardžić, one of the directors of the Institute for Balkan Studies in Belgrade, were direct Braudel's disciples, thus forming just one of the many links connecting Balkanology with the French historiographic school of *Annales*.

Another among those links between Balkanology, the Balkan archaeology and the interdisciplinary research of the long-term structures is the anthropogeographical school of Jovan Cvijić. Jovan Cvijić (1865-1927), the founder of modern Serbian geography and anthropogeography, one of the leading geographers of his time, laid in his extensive scholarly opus the cornerstone of the modern Balkanology. Spending his life pondering over the physical and cultural geography of the Balkans, in his capital work *Balkansko poluostrvo (The Balkan Peninsula)*, 1918, 1922-I, 1931-II) he synthesized the whole new area of research - the anthropogeography of the Balkans.²⁴ Treating the Balkan Peninsula as the unique entity of nature and culture, Cvijić equally used the results of geomorphological, as well as historical, ethnological and anthropogeographical researches. He captured all the complexity and correlation between geomorphological traits, hydrology and natural environment in general, with cultural history, the way of life, the character of settlements, the way of production, cultural areas and even the mentality and the physical traits of the inhabitants.

Cvijić's approach to culture as a nucleus of anthropogeographical research drifted him apart from the then dominant Ratzel's geographically deterministic anthropogeographical school. Cvijić himself clearly stated his parting with Ratzel in the introduction to the French edition of *The Balkan Peninsula*: "This endeavour was even harder due to the fact that my concept of human geography differs significantly from the one formulated in the important works of Ratzel and Jean Brun. I have always thought that they exclude man from human geography and that they do not pay enough attention to the questions common to geography and sociology, but which cannot be overlooked by geography."²⁵ The association of natural and social sciences into an unique science about man and his environment, argued for by Cvijić, is rightly considered as one of the most important methodological

23 Ф. Бродел, 1992, 17.

24 Ј. Цвијић, 1987.

25 Ј. Цвијић, 1918, II: Д. Недељковић, 1968, 13.

turning-points in geography.²⁶ This attitude approached him to the French geographical school of Vidal de la Blache and to the historiographical school of the *Annales*, itself in the formative period at the time of publishing of the French edition of *The Balkan Peninsula* (1918). Lucien Febvre, the disciple of Vidal de la Blache, built his synthesis of geography and history (geohistory), later developed and elaborated by Braudel, precisely by criticizing Ratzel's geographical determinism.²⁷ Febvre wrote in 1920, rejecting the geographical determinism, that there are no *necessities*, but only *possibilities*, as well as that the natural environment influences man indirectly, via social structures and ideas.²⁸ Incidentally, Cvijić was summoned by Vidal de la Blache to hold a course on geography of the Balkan Peninsula at Sorbonne, during the World War I (1917 and 1918), and, in 1918, his book *The Balkan Peninsula* was published in Paris.²⁹ Predrag Novaković, who was the first to explicitly associate Cvijić, Braudel and the school of *Annales* and to point to the archaeological aspect of their theories, spoke of the indirect connection between Cvijić and Braudel, via the French geographical possibilistic school of Vidal de la Blache, but cautiously left impending the supposition that the Serbian geographer might have influenced his French colleagues in a direct manner, by his lectures in Paris and the book published in French.³⁰

By the conspicuous interdisciplinary character of his work Cvijić profoundly influenced the discipline of Balkanology, especially its historiographical and ethnological aspects. His research into migrations in the Balkans, origins of population and settlements, in many aspects remained unsurpassed until today, and his study *Uputstva za ispitivanje naselja i psihičkih osobina (Instructions for the Research of Settlements and Psychological Characteristics, 1911)* is the necessary literature for the generations of ethnographers. The intertwining of social and natural sciences in the anthropogeographical synthesis of Cvijić, as well as his bend towards sociology, built solid cultural and anthropological framework of Balkanology as a scientific discipline. Cvijić's concept of cultural belts (zones of civilization) of the Balkans illustrates the fact vividly. His concept of cultural belts has nothing in common with the German school of cultural circles (Kulturkreisreihe), whose method was to cluster different peoples and cultural phenomena into unique group according to some superficial formal similarities.³¹ Cultural belts, as seen by Cvijić, present a wide historical-geographical synthesis, in which a decisive role is played by geographical and geomorphological factors, an idea later developed by American anthropologists in their theory of culture areas and culture change, very

26 Д. Нелџковић, 1968; А. Стојковић, 1982, 438-439.

27 А. Митровић, 1992, 377.

28 J. Bintrif, 1991, 11.

29 P. Vujević, 1957, 10.

30 P. Novaković, 1992, 23.

31 M. Filipović, 1968, 34.

influential in modern archaeology.³² Cvijić saw the cultural belts as a dynamic correlation of geomorphological and cultural phenomena. The Balkans, being the perennial junction of civilizations and the place of their contacts, saw an apparently discontinuous history of civilization.³³ This situation, according to Cvijić, led to the creation of the distinct cultural belts in the Balkans, such as the belt of the transformed Byzantine civilization, the belt of Turkish oriental influences, the belt of Western civilization and the belt of the patriarchal regime, whose actor mainly was the Dinaric anthropological type and to which Cvijić paid special attention.³⁴ This division in its criterion and character fully corresponds to the comparative synchronic and diachronic approach of the modern Balkanology, for it is not based upon national elements, but stresses the existent cultural and ethnic influences and civilizational zones in certain geographical units.³⁵ The sharp observations on cultural belts made by Cvijić bear obvious anthropological, and even archaeological dimension. He pointed that the span of the cultural belts does not depend solely upon geographical factors, but that they expand and recede, as dynamic cultural organisms. It is noteworthy to cite his "geological" - or archaeological - paradigm on cultures that lie one above the other as geological layers, or get mutually intertwined, but it still is possible to distinguish the areas where one of the cultures made more impact than the other.³⁶ This idea has not roused the attention of archaeologists, although the more minute analysis of distribution of distinct prehistoric or historic cultures and civilizations would certainly show certain approximations to the cultural belts described by Cvijić.

It is well known that Cvijić paid attention to the "psychical types" of the Balkan population, an endeavour characterized by the later scholars as the most daring, although the most disputable of all his scientific conclusions.³⁷ Strictly following his scientific principle, Cvijić saw the geomorphological traits of the terrain as the leading reference for determining certain types: "It may be concluded, based upon experience and knowledge, that certain psychical characteristics are related to respective geographically individualized areas".³⁸

The method of studying psychological types of population and associating them with certain geographic areas was applied in the French geographical school by Vidal de la Blache and his disciples, such as Lucien Febvre.³⁹ The study of "mentality" thus became an important methodological aspect, characteristic of the *Annales* school and its followers of all generations. Braudel treated "mentality" as one

32 С. Токарев, 1982; М. Филиповић, 1968, 34-35; Р. Novaković, 1992, 19-22.

33 А. Palavestra, 1981, 14.

34 Ј. Цвијић, 1987а, 69-81.

35 А. Palavestra, 1981, 14.

36 Ј. Цвијић, 1987а, 70; М. Филиповић, 1968, 34-35.

37 С. Токарев, 1982, 364.

38 А. Palavestra, 1981, 15.

39 Ж. Сион, 1921, 276-287; А. Стојковић, 1982.

of the structures active in the planes of long- and middle-term history. The treatment of "mentality" as a structure dependent upon geography, but also upon culture, the way it was conceptualized in the *Annales* school, as well as in the works of Cvijić, has become increasingly appealing for archaeologists. John Bintliff stresses that the mutual influence of the way of thinking and believing of a group, and a historical process, in all of the three planes of structural history, is a crucial concept that may well overcome the mechanistic and deterministic tendencies both in the history of the *Annales* school and the New Archaeology.⁴⁰ Predrag Novaković, on the other hand, points to the analysis of psychical types performed by Cvijić and argues for relating it to archaeological models and research. The hint made by Novaković on analogies between the Hallstatt society with the tribal system of Montenegro and a kind of prestige gift economy that existed among them, may be especially interesting.⁴¹

Although archaeology rarely explicitly stated its theoretical links to the anthropogeographical school of Cvijić, numerous archaeological projects of the Institute for Balkan Studies, Belgrade, used his cultural models - as well as the models of Balkanological ethnography and historiography - in forming hypothetical and paradigmatic cultural models of prehistory of the Balkans.

The research of the prehistoric settlements in the microregion of the Ribarska river near Kruševac (central Serbia), undertaken in 1985 and 1986 by the Institute for Balkan Studies, was well founded upon the models akin to the "long-term history".⁴² The starting supposition was that the existing ethnographic and historical data on the pre-industrial village of the central Balkans may provide for forming hypotheses on the prehistoric habitation of the region. These hypotheses were to be tested by the planned archaeological field research. The model of "rural continuity" was based upon the presumptions on economic rationalism both in prehistoric and historic times. The idea itself of the continuity of the basic productive and economic realities of the rural life in the Balkans was implicitly present earlier, in the ethnographic sources of the anthropogeographical school of Cvijić, but also in the archaeological synthesis of the Balkanic prehistory. Ethnographic and historical material pointed to the existence of two distinct socio-economic systems in this area during the Middle Ages and the pre-industrial modern period: sedentary agriculture and nomadic cattle-breeding - as well as to the specific respective criteria in choosing a habitation. By comparing the known data on geographical setting of the prehistoric habitations and the economy in certain stages of prehistory with the ethnographic ma-

40 J. Bintliff, 1991, 11.

41 P. Novaković, 1992, 26.

42 A. Bankoff, A. Palavestra, 1986; A. Palavestra, A. Benkof, 1986; A. Palavestra, A. Benkof, 1986a.

terial, the archaeological models of habitation in the prehistory of the central Balkans were formed. This method, based upon the combined ethnographic, anthropogeographic and archaeological data, pointed to the three elementary models of habitation in the prehistory of the Morava River valley and central Serbia in prehistory.

During the Vinča period (Late Neolithic), the model assumed sedentary sites at the fringes of the alluvia along the middle course of smaller rivers, at certain distance from the Morava valley itself. The land was suitable there for mattock agriculture, and the wooded lake terraces next to alluvium offered hunting and gathering possibilities, as well as good pastures for herds. Eneolithic and Early Bronze Age settlements, according to the model, were small and scattered (the *starovlaški* type of village by Cvijić), that may well have been the consequence of the greater self-sufficiency of households and the orientation towards nomadic cattle-breeding. The diverse agriculture required other criteria in choosing the site of habitation, now more frequent in upper streams of smaller rivers, and on moderate altitudes above the lake terraces. During the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages the model assumed several different types of habitation, as a consequence of the appearance of the specialized groups of cattle-breeders, procuring animal products for the larger sedentary agricultural population. The development of such a symbiotic system, in which the cattle-breeders practised the horizontal nomadic large-scale movements, as well as the ones on short distances, resulted in the appearance of at least three distinct types of habitation. The first type is a cattle-breeders' habitation near to summer pastures in mountains, the second type - the ones near winter pastures in planes and river valleys, and the third type is sedentary agricultural habitation. The latter, archaeologically the most readily recognized, might have been hierarchically organized. The model assumed their position on limits between two or more ecological zones (such as forest fringe), as well as by the main communications, although they retained the diffuse (*starovlaški*) pattern. The archaeological field research and the testing of the model have proven the presumptions on type and position of the Neolithic settlements, as well as the ones of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages.⁴³

Another archaeological model founded upon the principles of Cvijić's anthropogeography of the Balkans and the results of his school, dealt with the phenomenon of the princely tombs of the Early Iron Age in the central Balkans and the prestige goods exchange.⁴⁴ The geographical distribution of the rich princely tombs, as well as the character of the luxury items imported from the Mediterranean, suggested the importance that communications and the control over

43 A. Bankoff, A. Palavestra, 1986; A. Palavestra, A. Benkof, 1986; A. Palavestra, A. Benkof, 1986a.

44 A. Palavestra, 1989; A. Palavestra, 1993, 281-288; and 1994.

them had in this epoch of the history of the Balkans. The works of Jovan Cvijić, as well as other anthropogeographers, ethnographers and historians, have offered the abundant material on the main natural communications connecting the Adriatic (and the Mediterranean) with the Balkan hinterland. The three main routes, in use for centuries, were: *Via Egnatia*, from Drač, via Ohrid to Thessaloniki; the *Skhoder-Prizren route* from Leš and Skhoder to Metochia and Kosovo; and, finally, the *Dubrovnik route*, over Trebinje to Novi Pazar and western Serbia. The princely tombs are situated not only along these routes, but on their most important junctions. Such a distribution of the princely tombs pointed to the specific mode of trade in central Balkans in the Early Iron Age. The supposed way of life of the paleo-Balkan tribes, including permanent mobility, nomadism and a specific type of settlement, does not imply the development of prominent redistributive centers. On the contrary, the distribution of the rich tombs points to the caravan-trade in prehistory, the same as is well known to have been operating along these same routes during the Roman, medieval, and even modern times. It was probably the caravan-trade model that included the control and "possession" of routes. The princes of the central Balkans had abundant goods to offer in exchange for the Mediterranean luxury, offered to them both for economic and political reasons.⁴⁵ The review of the goods exported from this region during the Middle Ages may offer a fairly exact approximation of the merchandise exchanged in prehistory. The list includes hides, wool, furs, cattle, wax, honey, but also some rare plants, pigments and slaves. This model of trade has been shaped on the basis of the distribution of the princely tombs and the recent research of society and economy of the prehistoric Europe in the first millenium B.C.⁴⁶ However, the basic structure of the model, as well as the material itself, was provided by the works of Jovan Cvijić and his disciples among the Yugoslav historians and ethnographers.⁴⁷

While conceptualizing a theoretical model or an interpretation of the finds from the Balkans, archaeologists may always consult virtually infinite material recorded by Cvijić and the researchers of his anthropological school, respectively geographers, historians or ethnologists. Accordingly, the researchers of the Mediterranean almost always can count on useful and beneficial hints from Braudel's material. However, it would be extremely erroneous and superficial to consider the Balkanology of Cvijić, or its counterpart, Braudel's "total history", as a collection of suitable analogies and examples. The concepts of Cvijić and Braudel offer a greater challenge to archaeologists. This theoretical system is a signpost to the discovery of enduring and deeply hidden structures of the past. These structures are not definite

45 S. Babić, 1990.

46 K. Kristiansen, J. Jensen, eds., 1994.

47 A. Palavestra, 1989.

or eternal, but stagnant and inert. Archaeology, together with other related disciplines, may render a part of these structures and the rhythm of their slow motions visible and comprehensive.

Translated by Staša Babić

АРХЕОЛОГИЈА, БАЛКАНОЛОГИЈА И ИСТОРИЈА ДУГОГ ТРАЈАЊА

Резиме

Балканологија је интердисциплинарна научна област која се бави Балканским полуострвом као посебном културноисторијском, лингвистичком и геополитичком целином. Настала крајем XIX и почетком XX века, у почетку углавном усмерена на лингвистичка проучавања, синхроничне и дијахроничне компаративне анализе балканских језика, балканологија је у XX веку проширила своје области истраживања и на питања историје, етнографије, књижевности, историје уметности, балканских народа. Проучавање балканске археологије у склопу оваквих компаративних студија данас је важан аспект балканологије, посебно заступљен у југословенској балканологији. Балканолошки институт САНУ (Београд), као и некадашњи Центар за балканолошка испитивања АНУБиХ (Сарајево), међу ретким су балканолошким институцијама у свету које су обухватале и археологију и посвећивале велику пажњу археолошким проучавањима Балкана. За овакав широк истраживачки спектар југословенска балканологија може да захвали, између осталог, и чињеници да је утемељена на принципима антропогеографске школе Јована Цвијић .

Јован Цвијић (1865-1927), оснивач модерне српске географије и антропогеографије, један од водећих географа свог доба, поставио је у своме великом научном опусу темеље модерне балканологије. Целог живота наднесен над проблемима физичке и културне географије Балкана, које је сумирао у свом капиталном делу *Балканско полуострво* (1918, 1922 -I, 1931 -II), Цвијић је синтетизовао читаву нову науку - антропогеографију Балкана. Посматрајући Балканско полуострво као јединствену целину природе и културе, Цвијић се служио у подједнакој мери резултатима геоморфолошких као и историјских, етнолошких и антропогеографских истраживања. Уочио је сву повезаност геоморфолошких особина, хидрологије и природне средине уопште, са културном историјом, начином живота, карактером насеља, начином припремања, културним појасевима, отвореношћу или затвореношћу неке средине, па и менталитетом и психичким особинама становништва. Цвијићево сагледавање *културе*, као језгра антропогеографског проучавања удаљило га је од, тада доминантне, Рацелове географски детерминистичке антропогеографске школе. У теоријском смислу, могу се уочити многе сродности између Цвијићеве антропогеографске школе и француске историографске школе *Анала*, нарочито Броделове "историје дугог (и средњег) трајања".

Југословенска балканологија управо се развијала на основама та два, веома сродна теоријска система - Цвијићеве антропогеографске школе, која је изнедрила балканологију, и "историје дугог трајања" за коју се залагао још Стојан Новаковић, а у извесној мери и Броделове школе, која је утицала на балканолошку историографију. Није случајно да је оснивач и први директор Балканолошког института САНУ био Цвијићев ученик и следбеник Васо Чубриловић, а да је његов наследник на месту директора исте институције, био Радован Самарџић, Броделов ђак.

Иако је археологија у оквиру балканологије ретко експлицирала своју теоријску повезаност са Цвијићевом антропогеографском школом, у више археолошких пројеката Балканолошког института САНУ, Цвијићеви културни модели

(и модели балканолошке етнологије и историографије), управо су послужили за формирање хипотетичких и парадигматских културних модела балканске праисторије (Палавестра 1981, 1989, 1993, 1994; Бенкоф и Палавестра 1986.). У тренутку када се археологија окреће Броделовој историографији и парадигми *Анала*, као могућој бази нових интерпретативних модела, Цвијићева антропогеографска школа и балканолошка археологија могу бити, у најмању руку, корисни сапутници.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Babić, S.,

1990 *Graeco-Barbarian Contacts in the Early Iron Age Central Balkans*, *Balcanica XXI*, 165-183.

Bankoff, A., Palavestra A.,

1986 *Prehistoric Settlements in the Ribarska Reka Microregion near Kruševac*, *Balcanica XVI-XVII*, 17-41.

Bintliff, J.,

1991 *The contribution of an Annaliste/structural history approach to archaeology*, *The Annales School and Archaeology* (J. Bintliff ed.), Leicester - London, 1-33.

Braudel, F.,

1990 *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, London.

Бродел, Ф.,

1992 *Списи о историји*, Београд.

Brun, P.,

1994 *From Hallstatt to La Tène Period in the Perspective of the Mediterranean World Economy*, *Europe in the First Millennium B.C.* (K. Kristiansen & J. Jensen eds.), Sheffield, 57-65.

Champion, T.,

1989 *Introduction. Centre and Periphery - Comparative Studies in Archaeology* (T. Champion ed.), London, 1-21.

Цвијић, Ј.,

1918 *La Péninsule Balkanique, Géographie humaine*, Paris.

1987 *Балканско полуострво*. Сабрана дела књ. 2, Београд.

1987a *Културни појаси Балканског полуострва*. Говори и чланци, Сабрана дела књ. 3/1, Београд, 55-81.

Тирковић, С.,

1965 *Село Стојана Новаковића*. Стојан Новаковић, Село, Београд, 7-12.

Gray, W.,

1969 *The Historical Explanation of Actions Reconsidered*. *Ideas of History* (R. Nash ed.), New York, 106-124.

Филиповић, М.,

1968 *Јован Цвијић и српска етнологија*. Цвијићев зборник (ур. М. Лутовац), Београд, 27-42.

Flannery, K.,

- 1973 *Archeology with a Capital S. Research and Theory in Current Archeology* (C. Redman ed.), New York, 47-58.

Hodder, I.,

- 1986 *Reading the Past*, Cambridge.
1987 *The contribution of the long term. Archaeology as long-term history* (I. Hodder ed.), Cambridge, 1-8.

Jagić, V.,

- 1893 *Село. Из дела "Народ и земља у старој српској држави" од Стојана Новаковића, Београд 1891, 8^о, VII. 261. Archiv für slavische Philologie 15. 108-117.*

Kristiansen, K., Jensen, J., eds.

- 1994 *Europe in the First Millennium B.C.*, Sheffield.

Leach, E.,

- 1973 *Concluding Address. The Explanation of Culture Change. Models in Prehistory* (C. Renfrew ed.), London, 761-771.

Mandelbaum, M.,

- 1969 *Historical explanation: The problem of "Covering Laws"*. Ideas of History (R. Nash ed.), New York, 124-140.

Митровић, А.,

- 1992 *Историјски списи Фернана Бродела. Фернан Бродел, Списи о историји, Београд, 371-383.*

Novaković, P.,

- 1992 *Po Marxu in pred Braudelom: Geografska šola Jovana Cvijića in arheologija*, Arheo 15, 8-28.

Новаковић, С.,

- 1965 *Село*, Београд.
1966 *Из српске историје*, Београд.

Недељковић, Ј.,

- 1968 *Основни методолошки преокрет у Цвијићевом научном делу, Цвијићев зборник* (ур. М. Лутовац), Београд, 9-15.

Palavestra, A.,

- 1981 *Balkanologija Jovana Cvijića*, Istraživač 1, 13-15.
1989 *Модели трговине и друштвене структуре на централном Балкану гвозденог доба*, Balcanica XX, 191-209.
1993 *Praistorijski ćilibar na centralnom i zapadnom Balkanu*. Beograd.
1994 *Prehistoric Trade and a Cultural Model for Princely Tombs in the Central Balkans*. Europe in the First Millennium B.C. (K. Kristiansen & J. Jensen, eds.), Sheffield, 45-56.

Palavestra, A., Benkof, A.,

- 1986 *Pozlatska reka, naselje poznog bronzanog doba*, Arheološki pregled 1985, 67-68.
1986a *Праисторијско насељавање у микрорегији Рибарске реке код Крушевца*, Гласник Српског археолошког друштва 3, 51-62.

Renfrew, C., Bahn P.,

1991 *Archaeology. Theories, Methods and Practice*, London.

Rowlands, M.,

1987 *Centre and periphery: a review of a concept*. Centre and Periphery in the Ancient World (M. Rowlands, M. Larsen & K. Kristiansen eds.). Cambridge, 1-11.

Самарцић, Р.,

1966 *Стојан Новаковић у српској историографији*. Стојан Новаковић, Из српске историје, Београд, 7-57.

Сион, Ж.,

1921 *Нова област у антропогеографији*, Гласник Српског географског друштва 5, 275-288.

Стевановић, М.,

1990 *"Нова археологија": да ли она има будућност?*. Balcanica XXI, 185-200.

Стојковић, А.,

1982 *Јован Цвијић о проблемима "научног духа и научне методе"*, Научно дело Јована Цвијића (ур. Р. Лукић, М. Лутовац, Д. Недељковић и П. Стевановић), Београд, 421-442.

Токарев, С.,

1982 *Научная методология Иована Цвичича и антропогеографическое направление в западноевропейской науке*, Научно дело Јована Цвијића (ур. Р. Лукић, М. Лутовац, Д. Недељковић и П. Стевановић), Београд, 353-364.

Trigger, В.,

1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought*, Cambridge.

Вујелић, П.,

1957 *Живот и јавни рад Јована Цвијића*, У спомен тридесетогодишњице смрти Јована Цвијића (ур. П. Јовановић), Београд, 5-13.

Weingartner, R.,

1969 *The Quarrel About Historical Explanation*. Ideas of History (R. Nash ed.), New York, 140-157.