

Pokrovnik - primjer ograđenoga neolitičkog naselja

Marijanović, Brunislav

Source / Izvornik: **Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu, 2017, 34, 5 - 44**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:291:808312>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution 3.0 Unported](#)/[Imenovanje 3.0](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-27**



INSTITUT ZA
ARHEOLOGIJU

Repository / Repozitorij:

[RIARH - Repository of the Institute of archaeology](#)

UDK 902
ISSN 1330-0644
VOL 34/2017.
ZAGREB, 2017.

Prilozi

Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu

Izdavač/Publisher
INSTITUT ZA ARHEOLOGIJU
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Adresa uredništva/Address of the editor's office
Institut za arheologiju/Institute of archaeology
HR-10000 Zagreb, Ulica Ljudevita Gaja 32
Hrvatska/Croatia
Telefon/Phone ++385/(0)1 61 50 250
Fax ++385(0)1 60 55 806
e-mail: urednistvo.prilozi@iarh.hr
http://www.iarh.hr

Glavni i odgovorni urednik/Editor in chief
Marko DIZDAR

Uredništvo/Editorial board
Marko DIZDAR, Snježana KARAVANIĆ, Viktória KISS (Budapest, HUN) (prapovijest/Prehistory),
Goranka LIPOVAC VRKLJAN (antika/Antiquities), Katarina Katja PREDOVNIK (Ljubljana, SLO),
Natascha MEHLER (Wien, AUT), Juraj BELAJ, Tatjana TKALČEC (kasni srednji vijek i novi vijek/
Late Middle Ages and Modern era), Predrag NOVAKOVIĆ (Ljubljana, SLO) (metodologija/
Methodology)

Izdavački savjet/Editorial advisory board
Dunja GLOGOVIĆ (Zagreb), Ivor KARAVANIĆ (Zagreb), Laszlo KÓVACS (Budapest, HUN),
Kornelija MINICHREITER (Zagreb), Mladen RADIĆ (Osijek), Aleksandar RUTTKAY (Nitra, SK),
Ivančica SCHRUNK (Minneapolis, USA), Željko TOMIČIĆ (Zagreb), Ante UGLEŠIĆ (Zadar)

Prijevod na engleski/English translation
Katia Francesca ACHINO, Ana ĐUKIĆ, Marija KOSTIĆ, Vladimir KUSIK, Marko MARAS,
Ognjen MLADENOVIĆ, Meta OSREDKAR, Barbara SMITH-DEMO

Lektura/Language editor
Ivana MAJER (hrvatski jezik/Croatian, slovenski jezik/Slovenian, srpski jezik/Serbian)
Caitleen BREEN, Marko MARAS (engleski jezik/English)

Korektura/Proofreads
Katarina BOTIĆ
Marko DIZDAR

Grafičko oblikovanje/Graphic design
Roko BOLANČA

Računalni slog/Layout
Hrvoje JAMBREK

Tisak/Printed by
Printera Grupa d.o.o., Sv. Nedelja

Naklada/Issued
400 primjeraka/400 copies

Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu uključeni su u sljedeće indekse/
Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu are included in following indices:
DYABOLA – Sachkatalog der Bibliothek – Römisch-Germanische Kommission des Deutschen
Archaeologischen Instituts, Frankfurt a. Main
Clarivate Analytics services – Emerging Sources Citation Index
CNRS/INIST – Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique/L'Institut de l'Information Scientifique
et Technique, Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy
EBSCO – Information services, Ipswich
ERIH – European Reference Index for the Humanities, European Science Foundation, Strasbourg
SciVerse Scopus – Elsevier, Amsterdam



Sadržaj

Izvorni znanstveni radovi

- 5 BRUNISLAV MARIJANOVIĆ
Pokrovnik – primjer ograđenoga neolitičkog naselja
- 45 KRISTINA HORVAT
DARIO VUJEVIĆ
Pokrovnik – materijalna kultura neolitičkog naselja
- 83 KATIA FRANCESCA ACHINO
BORUT TOŠKAN
ANTON VELUŠČEK
Potentiality of intra-site spatial analysis and post-depositional processes: a Slovenian case study
Resnikov prekop
- 101 LUCIJA GRAHEK
Iška Loka in grob iz Matene – nova otkrića o pozni
bronasti dobi na Ljubljanskem barju
- 123 MARTINA BLEČIĆ KAVUR
Mala tijela u velikom svijetu: antropo-ornitomorfni
privjesci željeznog doba Caput Adriae
- 143 VOJISLAV FILIPOVIĆ
OGNJEN MLADENOVIĆ
Prilog proučavanju članaka astragalnih pojaseva sa
teritorije centralne i jugoistočne Evrope
- 185 DOMAGOJ PERKIĆ
Crkva sv. Jurja u Mateškom Selu: nalazi iz grobova
kasnoga srednjeg i novog vijeka

Contents

Original scientific papers

- BRUNISLAV MARIJANOVIĆ
*Pokrovnik – An Example of an Enclosed Neolithic
Settlement*
- KRISTINA HORVAT
DARIO VUJEVIĆ
*Pokrovnik – The Material Culture of the Neolithic
Settlement*
- KATIA FRANCESCA ACHINO
BORUT TOŠKAN
ANTON VELUŠČEK
*Potencial znotrajnajdiščne prostorske analize
za razumevanje poodložitvenih procesov v
nadzorovanih okoliščinah: študija s kolišča
Resnikov prekop (Slovenija)*
- LUCIJA GRAHEK
*Iška Loka and the Grave from Matena – New
Findings on the Late Bronze Age in the Ljubljana
Marshes*
- MARTINA BLEČIĆ KAVUR
*Small bodies in a big world: anthropo-
ornithomorphic Iron Age pendants from Caput
Adriae*
- VOJISLAV FILIPOVIĆ
OGNJEN MLADENOVIĆ
*Contribution to the Study of Astragal Belt Segments
from the Territory of Central and Southeastern
Europe*
- DOMAGOJ PERKIĆ
*The Church of St. George in Mateško Selo: the finds
from the graves from the Late Middle Ages and the
Modern Age*

Prethodno priopćenje

227 SLAVICA FILIPOVIĆ
VLADIMIR KUSIK
Mjesto štovanja Silvana u Mursi

Preliminary communication

SLAVICA FILIPOVIĆ
VLADIMIR KUSIK
Place of worship of Silvanus in Mursa

241 UPUTE AUTORIMA

GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Pokrovnik – primjer ograđenoga neolitičkog naselja

Pokrovnik – An Example of an Enclosed Neolithic Settlement

Izvorni znanstveni rad
Prapovijesna arheologija

*Original scientific paper
Prehistoric archaeology*

BRUNISLAV MARIJANOVIĆ
Odjel za arheologiju, Sveučilište u Zadru
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV/2
HR-23000 Zadar
bmarijan@unizd.hr

UDK/UDC 903.4(497.5 Pokrovnik)“634”

Primljeno/Received: 10. 01. 2017.

Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 20. 06. 2017.

U članku se iznose rezultati istraživanja provedenih od 2010. do 2011. i 2013. na neolitičkom nalazištu impresokeramičke i danilske kulture Pokrovnik kod Drniša, na kojem su već prethodno iskopavanja vodila dva druga istraživača: Z. Brusić 1979. i A. M. T. Moore 2006. Uz osnovne podatke o stratigrafskim odnosima i općoj kulturološkoj slici te ostacima različitih vrsta nastambi, izlaganje je posebno koncentrirano na otkriće masivnih kamenih struktura čije postojanje nije ustanovljeno samo arheološkim iskopavanjem nego je geofizičkim istraživanjima potvrđeno na čitavoj površini nalazišta. Masivnost i broj tih struktura upućuju na postojanje složenog sustava ograđivanja naselja istovrsnim kamenim strukturama.

Ključne riječi: naselje, rani neolitik, srednji neolitik, impresokeramička kultura, danilska kultura, masivne kamene strukture, ograđivanje naselja

The paper presents results of the excavations conducted from 2010 to 2011, and in 2013, in Pokrovnik near Drniš, the Neolithic site with phases of the Impressed Ware and Danilo cultures. The site had already been excavated by two other researchers: Z. Brusić in 1979 and A. M. T. Moore in 2006. In addition to presentation of stratigraphic relations and general culturological image, special attention is paid to recovery of massive stone structures whose existence was not only attested in the archaeological excavations but it was also confirmed by geophysical surveys in the entire area of the site. Massiveness and number of these structures indicate to presence of a complex enclosure system of the settlement with identical stone structures.

Keywords: settlement, Early Neolithic, Middle Neolithic, Impressed Ware culture, Danilo culture, massive stone structures, enclosing of settlement

UVOD

Neolitičko nalazište Pokrovnik kod Drniša arheološkoj je javnosti poznato već više desetljeća zahvaljujući ponajprije iskopavanjima koja je 1979. tamo vodio Z. Brusić (Brusić 1980: 19–20; 2008), a odnedavno ponajviše zbog iznimnog primjera ranoneolitičke antropomorfne figurine, i prema istraživanjima koja je 2006. proveo A. M. T. Moore sa suradnicima (Moore et al. 2007; 2007a; 2007b; 2010; 2011; McClure et al. 2014; McClure, Podrug 2009; 2016; Mendušić, Moore 2013; Legge, Moore 2011; Marguš et al. 2008; Podrug et al. 2014; Smith, Moore 2006).¹ Nema nikakve dvojbe da su oba istraživačka zahvata, svaki na svoj način, pridonijela proširivanju općih a u nekim segmentima i posebnih znanja o neolitiku na području istočnog Jadrana, jednako kao što je

¹ Rezultati provedenih istraživanja još nisu integralno objavljeni, a više-kratna izvješća priredena za različite prigode uglavnom su uopćena ili donose parcijalne obrade pojedinih aspekata, pa ne sadržavaju dovoljno informacija za kritičku valorizaciju interpretacija koje se u tim prigodama iznose.

INTRODUCTION

The Neolithic settlement of Pokrovnik near Drniš has been known in archaeological circles for a few decades primarily owing to excavations managed by Z. Brusić in 1979 (Brusić 1980: 19–20; 2008), and recently primarily because of an exceptional example of the Early Neolithic anthropomorphic figurine, but also in relation to research conducted in 2006 by A. M. T. Moore with associates (Moore et al. 2007; 2007a; 2007b; 2010; 2011; McClure et al. 2014; McClure, Podrug 2009; 2016; Mendušić, Moore 2013; Legge, Moore 2011; Marguš et al. 2008; Podrug et al. 2014; Smith, Moore 2006).¹ There is no doubt that both research procedures, each in its own way, contributed to improving general and in certain aspects specific insights about the Neolithic in the

¹ The research results have not been published integrally, and several reports written for different occasions are mostly general or presenting partial analyses of specific aspects so they do not offer enough information for critical valorization of interpretations offered.

sigurno da nijedno od njih nije potpuno otklonilo istraživačke interese drugih istraživača niti isključilo mogućnost pa i potrebu poduzimanja novih terenskih zahvata na istom nalazištu.

Iskopavanje Z. Brusića provedeno je na dvije odvojene zemljišne parcele, na čijim je rubovima u dva paralelna niza bilo raspoređeno šest manjih i međusobno nepovezanih istraživačkih površina, dok je jedna istraživačka jedinica postavljena na pretpostavljenoj južnoj periferiji nalazišta, a ukupno istražena površina iznosila je 114 m² (sl. 1–2). Kako je i sam istraživač naglasio, to je istraživanje imalo za cilj tek utvrditi osnovne arheološke potencijale nalazišta, njegovu opću kulturnu sliku i stratigrafske odnose, te osigurati pouzdana polazišta za razvijanje kasnijih sustavnih iskopavanja (Brusić 2008: 9, 41). Svi postavljeni ciljevi tako koncipiranoga istraživačkog zadatka posve su dostignuti, ali je količina i raznovrsnost prikupljene arheološke građe koja je pružila vrlo dobar uvid u fizionomije zastupljenih neolitičkih kultura – impresokeramičke i danilske – daleko nadmašila očekivanja pokusnog iskopavanja i istraživaču omogućila kasniju monografsku objavu inicijalnih istraživanja i bez provođenja daljnjih istraživačkih zahvata. Ipak, strategija otvaranja većeg broja manjih površina, primjerena temeljnim istraživačkim ciljevima, nije mogla osigurati kvalitetnije podatke o cjelini neolitičke aglomeracije, pa su pitanja vezana uz izgled i organizaciju naselja, vrste i tipove nastambi, tehnike njihova građenja i korištene materijale te druge važne naseobinske aspekte, ostala bez odgovora. To je sasvim jasno naglasio i sam istraživač (Brusić 2008: 41). Za naselje ranog neolitika samo su navedeni „dijelovi stambene arhitekture, odnosno dio zidova, jedno ognjište i nekoliko vatrišta“, a među otkrivenim konstrukcijama posebno je zanimljiva ona koju je autor opisao kao „kvalitetniji kameni nasip s lomljenim kamenjem unutar žute glinaste zemlje“ (Brusić 2008: 42, T. IV: 1–2; sl. 5). Posve je jednaka situacija i u danilskoj fazi naselja što je i sam autor jasno predočio: „Teško je i u ovoj fazi naseljavanja na Pokrovniku govoriti o prostorima za stanovanje. Možda bi se oni mogli jedino identificirati u kamenim nakupinama iz prethodne faze zbog svoga pravilnijeg pružanja i nekakvog reda.“ (Brusić 2008: 51). U tom je kontekstu najzanimljiviji „kameni nasip debljine 30 do 50 cm“ u sondi IV koji bi se, prema mišljenju autora, „mogao protumačiti jedino kao ostatak kamenog nasipa koji je okruživao naselje“ (Brusić 2008: 9, 51).

Iskopavanje A. Moorea, poduzeto četvrt stoljeća kasnije, polazilo je od posve drukčijih ciljeva koji su uključeni u šire koncipirani projekt istraživanja procesa neolitizacije na području Dalmacije, pa je, primjereno takvoj istraživačkoj koncepciji, imalo karakter bioarheoloških istraživanja i primarno je bilo orijentirano na privredne aspekte zajednica kojima je naselje pripadalo. Istraživanje kojem je prethodila geofizička prospekcija, provedeno je na četiri manje i međusobno nepovezane istraživačke jedinice (A–D), raspoređene u jednom nizu na nalazišnoj površini koja leži između parcela obuhvaćenih istraživanjem Z. Brusića, a ukupna istraživačka površina iznosila je 64 m² (sl. 3). Prostorna orijentacija istraživanja na taj dio nalazišta posve je razumljiva ponajprije zbog toga što su podatci o debljini depozita i općim

eastern Adriatic region, but it is just as certain that none of them extinguished research interests of other researchers, nor did they eliminate the possibility and even need to undertake new excavations at the same site.

Excavations by Z. Brusić were conducted on two separate land plots on whose edges were two parallel rows of six small and unrelated research units, while one research unit was set on the assumed southern periphery of the site. Total excavated area measured 114 m² (Fig. 1–2). As the researcher himself stated, the aim of this research was only to assess basic archaeological potential of the site, its general cultural image and stratigraphic relations, and to ensure reliable starting points for developing subsequent systematic excavations (Brusić 2008: 9, 41). All goals of research mission conceived in this way had been achieved, but the amount and diversity of the archaeological finds surpassed by far expectations of trial excavations and offered a good view of characteristics of the represented Neolithic cultures – the Impressed Ware and Danilo cultures. Therefore the researcher was able to publish the initial research results in a monograph without conducting further research. However the research strategy of opening a number of small areas, in accordance with the basic research aims, could not provide more quality information about the whole of the Neolithic agglomeration so that the questions concerning appearance and organization of the settlement, kinds and types of houses, construction techniques and materials used, and other important settlement aspects remained unanswered (Brusić 2008: 41). For the Early Neolithic settlement only “parts of houses, that is wall fragments, a hearth and several fireplaces” were mentioned, and particularly interesting unearthed construction is the one described by the author as “more quality stone fill of broken stone in yellow clayey soil” (Brusić 2008: 42, Pl. IV: 1–2; Fig. 5). The situation was identical for the Danilo phase of the settlement as clearly presented by the author: “It is difficult to discuss dwelling areas in this phase of settling. Perhaps they could be identified only in stone heaps from the previous phase due to their more regular spreading and some sort of arrangement.” (Brusić 2008: 51). “Stone fill 30 to 50 cm thick” is most interesting in that context in probe IV which in the author’s opinion “might be interpreted as the remains of a stone embankment enclosing the settlement” (Brusić 2008: 9, 51).

Excavations by A. Moore, undertaken a quarter century later, started from quite different aims included into a more broadly conceived project of research of the Neolithization process in the region of Dalmatia so that it had character of bioarchaeological research in line with such research concept, and it was primarily directed at economic aspects of the communities that lived in the settlement. The research which was preceded by geophysical prospection was conducted on four smaller and mutually unrelated research units (A–D), distributed in a row in the area between the plots encompassed by Z. Brusić’s research. Total excavation area measured 64 m² (Fig. 3). Spatial orientation of the excavations on this part of the site is quite understandable primarily because information on deposit thickness and general stratigraphic relations known from the previous research

stratigrafskim odnosima, poznati s prethodno provedenih istraživanja, mogli poslužiti kao siguran oslonac u vođenju iskopavanja, dok su s druge strane upućivali na vjerojatnost da bi na tom prostoru moglo biti i samo središte neolitičkog naselja (Brusić 2008: 11, sl. 1). Osim toga, zbog promjene u namjeni obradivih parcela koje se danas koriste za uzgajanje dugogodišnjih kultura, to je jedna od ukupno dviju nalazišnih površina na kojima je istraživanje uopće bilo moguće provesti. Kako rezultati tih istraživanja još nisu sustavno prezentirani, njihov krajnji domet u ovom trenutku nije moguće procijeniti. Ipak, jedno je gotovo sigurno. Kao što ni iskopavanje koja je proveo Z. Brusić nije pridonijelo boljem i sigurnijem poznavanju naseobinske cjeline i njezina funkcioniranja, tako ni od iskopavanja A. Moorea u tom smislu ne treba očekivati radikalan pomak, ponajprije zbog metode izoliranih kvadrata primijenjene pri njegovu iskopavanju. Istina, ta je metoda primjerena istraživačkoj strategiji i postavljenim osnovnim ciljevima istraživanja, ali zasigurno nije prikladna za spoznavanje širih prostornih odnosa i pojava na naseobinskoj razini.

U preliminarnoj objavi rezultata istraživanja za naselje ranog neolitika izneseni su samo sumarni podatci o postojanju više stambenih horizonata, ognjišta i pokoje jame, te podatci o masivnim kamenim konstrukcijama koje su, prema autorovu mišljenju, služile kao terase i ogradni zidovi: "The remains of the Impressed Ware settlement consisted of patches of stones and multiple layers of habitation debris, hearths and occasional pits. Then, soon after the foundation of the village, the inhabitants built massive stone walls from north to south across the site, at right angles to the original slope. We found remains of these walls in all three of the main trenches, D, A, and C. The stone walls probably served as terrace and boundary walls, given their bulk and orientation." (Moore et al. 2007: 28).

Za naselje danijske kulture, uz sumirane podatke o postojanju više stambenih horizonata, ostataka zidova, nalazima kućnog lijepa, površinama prekrivenim nabijenim sitnim kamenjem, na jednoj od istraživačkih površina (kv. C) istraživač navodi čitav kompleks zidova, a interpretira ih na isti način na koji su interpretirane istovrsne ili slične formacije iz depozita ranog neolitika: "The levels of this later village consisted again of dense occupation debris and traces of walls. Pieces of daub were an abundant find, derived from collapsed buildings. There were also numerous pebble pavements that had been laid down to consolidate the sticky clay surface of the site. (...) Trench C had the same sequence of occupation but the deposits were shallower. They consisted of a series of stone walls in a complex arrangement. Again, the most likely interpretation is that these served as terrace or boundary walls, this time, however, at the edge of the settlement." (Moore et al. 2007: 28, sl. 2).

Navedene podatke i interpretacije njihova karaktera i namjene svakako bi bilo najbolje komparirati s rezultatima geofizičkih prospekcija. Međutim, budući da istraživanja nisu iscrpno objavljena, u ovom je trenutku nepoznato koji su dijelovi nalazišta obuhvaćeni tom vrstom istraživanja te

could be used as a reliable basis in excavation organization and on the other hand they indicated to a possibility that center of the Neolithic settlement may have been situated in this area (Brusić 2008: 11, Fig. 1). Furthermore since arable plots are presently used for growing perennial crops, it was one of two areas at the site where research was possible at all. Since research results have not been published, their final scope cannot be estimated as yet. However one thing is for sure. As the excavations by Z. Brusić did not contribute to better and more consistent understanding of the settlement whole and its functioning, we should not expect radical improvements in that sense from the excavations by A. Moore first and foremost because of the method of isolated quadrats applied in his excavations. Admittedly this method corresponds well to the research strategy and main research goals, but it is definitely not appropriate for understanding wider spatial relations and phenomena concerning settlement organization.


In the preliminary publication of research results for the Early Neolithic settlement, only sketchy information has been provided about the presence of several occupation horizons, a hearth and few pits, and information on massive stone constructions used as terraces and enclosure walls in the author's opinion: "The remains of the Impressed Ware settlement consisted of patches of stones and multiple layers of habitation debris, hearths and occasional pits. Then, soon after the foundation of the village, the inhabitants built massive stone walls from north to south across the site, at right angles to the original slope. We found remains of these walls in all three of the main trenches, D, A, and C. The stone walls probably served as terrace and boundary walls, given their bulk and orientation." (Moore et al. 2007: 28).

As for the Danilo culture settlement, in addition to lapidary information on presence of several occupation horizons, wall remains, daub finds, areas paved with pebbles, the author also mentions (quadrant C) an entire complex of walls, and interprets them in the same way as the similar or identical formations from the Early Neolithic deposit: "The levels of this later village consisted again of dense occupation debris and traces of walls. Pieces of daub were an abundant find, derived from collapsed buildings. There were also numerous pebble pavements that had been laid down to consolidate the sticky clay surface of the site. (...) Trench C had the same sequence of occupation but the deposits were shallower. They consisted of a series of stone walls in a complex arrangement. Again, the most likely interpretation is that these served as terrace or boundary walls, this time, however, at the edge of the settlement." (Moore et al. 2007: 28, Fig. 2).

Mentioned data and interpretation of their character and function should definitely be compared with the results of geophysical prospections. However since the research has not been published comprehensively, at the moment we do not know which segments of the site were encompassed by this kind of survey, and in what way massive and long stone constructions (mentioned by the researcher, Z.



Sl. 1 Plan iskopavanja 1979. (prema Brusić 2008)
Fig. 1 Plan of the 1979 excavations (after Brusić 2008)



Sl. 2 Dijelovi nalazišta istraženi 1979. (prema Brusić 2008)
Fig. 2 Parts of the site excavated in 1979 (after Brusić 2008)



Sl. 3 Dio nalazišta istražen 2006. (prema Moore 2007)

Fig. 3 Part of the site excavated in 2006 (after Moore 2007)

kako se u tako dobivene rezultate uklapaju masivne i druge kamene konstrukcije koje navodi sam istraživač, one koje donosi Z. Brusić, ali i ove koje će ovdje biti predstavljene.

ISTRAŽIVANJE OD 2010. DO 2011. I 2013.

Iskopavanje koje je u okviru znanstvenog projekta *Rani prapovijesni periodi na području istočnog Jadrana*² provedeno tijekom tri istraživačke kampanje – 2010.–2011., 2013. – bilo je motivirano posve drukčijim istraživačkim razlozima. Naime, kako sam već naglasio, oba prethodna istraživača svoja su iskopavanja provela kroz otvaranje više manjih istraživačkih jedinica što je zasigurno osnovni razlog zbog kojeg o naseobinskim aspektima nalazišta na Pokrovniku nije bilo pouzdanih spoznaja. Iskopavanje od 2010. do 2011. te 2013. potaknuto je upravo potrebom otklanjanja ili smanjivanja tih praznina, što bi moglo bitno pridonijeti i boljem razumijevanju funkcioniranja jedne nevelike ali očigledno dugotrajne neolitičke aglomeracije u zadanom ambijentu i prostornom okviru. Naime, ovdje je potrebno naglasiti da

Brusić and the ones presented here) correspond to the results acquired in this way.

RESEARCH 2010–2011 AND 2013

The excavations undertaken within the scientific project „Early prehistoric periods in the eastern Adriatic region“² which were conducted in three research campaigns – 2010–2011, 2013, were motivated by completely different reasons for research. As I have already emphasized, both previous researchers conducted their excavations through opening several smaller research units which has to be the only reason for lack of reliable information on settlement aspects of the site of Pokrovnik. Excavations from 2010 to 2011, and in 2013 have been incited by the need to eliminate or reduce these gaps contributing in that way to better understanding of the way of life of a rather small but evidently long-lasting Neolithic agglomeration in a given environment and spatial framework. Here we have to emphasize that comparison of the available data from the previous research, to the extent

2 Projekt je financiralo Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i športa RH, a u iskopavanju su sudjelovali mr. sc. D. Vujević i K. Horvat, asistenti na Odjelu za arheologiju Sveučilišta u Zadru, diplomirani arheolozi A. Marinović, V. Glavaš, J. Popović, S. Dilber, A. Nakić, te tadašnji studenti arheologije na Sveučilišta u Zadru S. Bonković, B. Lazinica, I. Huljev, N. Očelić, B. Teklić, I. Volarević, M. Bodružić, A. Karadole, B. Peranić, N. Stepan, B. Lovrić, M. Matešić, I. Posedi, I. Krile, T. Zojčeski i E. Buća. Svim sudionicima zahvaljujem na predanom radu.

2 The project was financed by the Ministry of Science, Education and Sport, and the participants of the excavations were: Mr. sc. D. Vujević and K. Horvat, assistants at the Department of Archaeology of the University of Zadar, archaeologists: A. Marinović, V. Glavaš, J. Popović, S. Dilber, A. Nakić, and students of archaeology at the time at the University of Zadar: S. Bonković, B. Lazinica, I. Huljev, N. Očelić, B. Teklić, I. Volarević, M. Bodružić, A. Karadole, B. Peranić, N. Stepan, B. Lovrić, M. Matešić, I. Posedi, I. Krile, T. Zojčeski and E. Buća. I would like to thank them all for their dedicated work.

međusobna usporedba raspoloživih podataka s ranije provedenih istraživanja, u onoj mjeri u kojoj je ona moguća s obzirom na različite razine prezentiranja rezultata, pokazuje stanovite sličnosti u vrstama otkrivenih objekata ali i značajne razlike u njihovom broju i kvaliteti, a pogotovo u interpretaciji njihove svrhe i razloga postojanja. Naime, oba istraživača navode postojanje masivnih ili masivnijih konstrukcija ali u bitno različitom broju. Dok Z. Brusić navodi dva moguća primjera takvih konstrukcija koje bi mogle odgovarati zaštitnim zidovima oko naselja, A. Moore govori o mnoštvu složeno raspoređenih zidova u funkciji terasa ili ogradnih zidova. Iskopavanja Z. Brusića nisu rezultirala nikakvim značajnijim otkrićem ostataka nastambi, dok A. Moore izrijeком navodi više stambenih horizonata i u dijelu depozita koji pripada impresokeramičkoj i u onom dijelu koji pripada danilskoj kulturi, ali o njima ne donosi iscrpnije podatke. Moglo bi se navesti još nekoliko sličnih i prilično velikih razlika, ali smisao ovog priloga nije u njihovu pronalaženju i međusobnoj usporedbi. Razumije se, jedan dio navedenih razlika mogao bi biti i posljedica čistih slučajnosti uvjetovanih stvarnim razlikama koje postoje na različitim mikropozicijama ili pojedinim dijelovima nalazišne cjeline. Međutim, te su razlike brojnije od onih koje bi se mogle opravdati takvim mogućnostima, a razlike u kvalitativno bitno drukčijim interpretacijama vjerojatno istovrsnih ili funkcionalno vrlo srodnih pojava (masivne kamene konstrukcije) uopće nije moguće opravdati takvim razlozima. Sve su to bili i dodatni motivi za poduzimanje novog iskopavanja.

Za istraživanje u tom pravcu na raspolaganju su stajale dvije danas neobrađene parcele: jedna na kojoj je iskopavanje vodio A. Moore, a druga na samom istočnom rubu nalazišta, neposredno do seoskog puta, na kojoj u ranijim istraživanjima nije bilo nikakvih zahvata (sl. 2–3). Iskopavanje je izvedeno na oba raspoloživa dijela nalazišta i to otvaranjem dviju kompaktnih istraživačkih cjelina na ukupnoj površini od 188 m².

Primjereno postavljenim ciljevima, iskopavanje je započeto 2010. otvaranjem kompaktne površine od 70 m² (blok A) na pretpostavljenom središnjem dijelu naselja, postavljene uz jednu od površina (kv. B) obuhvaćenih iskopavanjima A. Moorea (sl. 4). Na tom se dijelu nalazišta ustanovljena debljina depozita kretala oko 150 cm, s približno ujednačenim odnosom između impresokeramičkog i danilskog dijela sloja, a obje kulture zastupljene su onim skupovima nalaza koji u njihovim kulturnim fizionomijama pripadaju standardnim pojavama (Brusić 2008).³

Premda su ti rezultati bili predvidljivi i očekivani, drugi rezultati iskopavanja na toj površini, pogotovo oni vezani uz stariji dio depozita, donijeli su vrlo važne spoznaje koje su bitno utjecale i na daljnji tijek i na samu koncepciju istraživanja.

U dijelu depozita koji pripada impresokeramičkoj kulturi izdvajaju se sljedeće stratigrafske cjeline.

Prvu čine jame plitko ukopane u zdravicu, s ležištima

³ Kulturna slika naselja ranog i srednjeg neolitika dobro je poznata na osnovi iskopavanja Z. Brusića, a za njezinu dopunu rezultatima ovih istraživanja usporediti prilog D. Vujevića i K. Horvat u ovom broju (Horvat, Vujević 2017).

allowed by the various levels of the result presentation, shows certain similarities regarding types of the objects recovered, but also considerable differences in their number and quality, and specially in interpretation of their function and reason of existence. Namely both researchers mention massive or somewhat massive constructions, but they differ in account of number. While Z. Brusić mentions two possible examples of such constructions which may correspond to defensive walls around the settlement, A. Moore writes about a multitude of walls in complex distribution functioning as terraces or enclosure walls. Excavations by Z. Brusić did not result in discovery of any significant house remains while A. Moore mentions several occupation horizons in the deposit segments of both Impressed Ware and Danilo cultures, but offers no details about them. We may mention several more similar, rather significant differences, but this paper does not aim at their identification and mutual comparison. Some of the mentioned differences may be related to pure coincidences caused by actual differences present on various micropositions or certain parts of the settlement whole. However these differences are so abundant that they cannot be justified in this way, and differences in qualitatively different interpretations of probably identical or functionally akin phenomena (massive stone constructions) cannot be explained by these reasons at all. These were additional motives for starting a new excavation.

There were two presently uncultivated plots suitable for such research. A. Moore had already excavated one of these plots, and the other was on the eastern periphery of the site, immediately next to the village road, which has not been excavated at all (Fig. 2–3). The excavations were conducted on both available parts of the site by opening two compact research units on the total area of 188 m².

In accordance with intended goals, the excavations commenced in 2010 by opening a compact area of 70 m² (block A) in the assumed central part of the settlement, located next to the one of areas (quadrat B) excavated by A. Moore (Fig. 4). Deposit was about 150 cm thick in this part of the site, with roughly even proportion of the Impressed Ware and Danilo parts of the layer, and both cultures are represented with typical find assemblages (Brusić 2008).³

Although these results were predictable and expected, other results of the excavations in this area, particularly the ones associated with the earlier part of the deposit, brought very important insights affecting further course and concept of the research.

Following stratigraphic units can be recognized in the Impressed Ware segment of the deposit.

The first one consists of shallow pits in the virgin soil, with several wide postholes (Fig. 5). Thin deposit is associated with these objects in both stratigraphic and relative chronological terms, with an average thickness of 10 cm, formed above the original prehistoric surface.

The other stratigraphic unit consists of two massive

³ Cultural image of the Early and Middle Neolithic settlement is well known on the basis of excavations by Z. Brusić, and for its supplement cf. paper by D. Vujević and K. Horvat in this issue (Horvat, Vujević 2017).



Sl. 4 Dio nalazišta istražen od 2010. do 2011. i 2013.
Fig. 4 Part of the site excavated from 2010 to 2011, and in 2013



Sl. 5 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; plitka jama ukopana u zdravicu i ležišta stupova
Fig. 5 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; shallow pit dug into virgin soil and postholes

više debljih stupova (sl. 5). S tim je objektima i stratigrafski i relativnokronološki povezan tanki depozit, prosječne debljine oko 10 cm, formiran iznad originalne prapovijesne površine.

Drugu stratigrafsku cjelinu čine dvije masivne kamene strukture čije širine mjestimice dosežu i do 150 cm, dok im sačuvana visina doseže do 55 cm, a obje leže na prethodno formiranom dijelu depozita koji je stratigrafski povezan sa spomenutim plitko ukopanim jamama (sl. 6–9). S tim formacijama koje zauzimaju najveći dio istraživačke površine, povezan je drugi i izrazitiji dio depozita ranog neolitika koji ponajprije karakteriziraju keramički nalazi s tipološkim i ukrasnim svojstvima podudarnim s onima iz donjeg dijela ovog depozita.⁴ U tom su dijelu depozita otkriveni i ostatci nadzemnih nastambi ranog neolitika.

Mlađi dio depozita u cjelini pripada danilskoj kulturi, znatno je koherentniji i bez kamenih struktura sličnih onima iz starijeg dijela depozita (sl. 10). U tom su dijelu depozita ustanovljeni više ili manje izraziti ostatci nadzemnih nastambi i pripadajućeg enterijera, a pojedini dijelovi podnica ustanovljenih nastambi potpuno pokrivaju one površine koje su u ranom neolitiku zauzimale kamene strukture (sl. 11).

stone structures whose widths reach as much as 150 cm at places, while their preserved height reaches up to 55 cm, and they both lie on previously formed part of the deposit which is stratigraphically related to the mentioned shallow pits (Fig. 6–9). These formations which take up the biggest part of the excavated surface are associated with other, more distinct part of the deposit of the Early Neolithic characterized primarily by pottery finds with typological and decorative characteristics corresponding to the ones from the lower part of this deposit.⁴ Remains of above-ground houses from the Early Neolithic were found in this part of the deposit as well.

Later part of the deposit belongs to the Danilo culture in entirety, it is more coherent and without stone structures similar to the ones from the earlier part of the deposit (Fig. 10). More or less distinct remains of above-ground houses and the belonging interior were found in this part of the deposit, and some floor patches of the houses cover the entire surfaces that belonged to the stone structures in the Early Neolithic (Fig. 11).

The Danilo culture is represented by more abundant and more diverse assemblages of finds than the Early Neolithic



Sl. 6 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; masivna kamena struktura preslojava stariji depozit
Fig. 6 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; earlier deposit overlaid by a massive stone structure

⁴ Usporediti prilog K. Horvat i D. Vujevića u ovom broju.

⁴ Cf. paper by K. Horvat and D. Vujević in this issue.




Sl. 7 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; masivne kamene strukture i plitka jama ukopana u zdravicu
 Fig. 7 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; massive stone structures and shallow pit dug into virgin soil

Danilska kultura predstavljena je većim brojem i znatno raznovrsnijim skupovima nalaza nego kultura ranog neolitika. To se ponajprije odnosi na oruđa od cijepanog i glačanog kamena te oruđa i ukrasne predmete od kosti. Jednako je brojna i keramička građa u kojoj su zastupljene sve pojave tipične za danilsku keramografiju s iznimkom slikane keramike dokumentirane samo pojedinačnim primjercima s pravocrtnim motivima. U standardne danilske pojave ulaze i ritoni na četiri noge, dobro zastupljeni brojnim ulomcima, kao i pojedinačni primjerci itifaličnih keramičkih predmeta (Horvat, Vujević 2017).

Kao što je na priloženim ilustracijama vrlo dobro vidljivo, dvije masivne kamene strukture iz mlađeg dijela impresokeramičkog depozita, od kojih se jedna pružala dijagonalno od jugozapadnog prema sjeveroistočnom kutu bloka A, a druga zauzimala čitav sjeverozapadni dio osnovne istraživačke površine, nisu zatvarale nikakav prostor niti sugerirale postojanje kakvoga određenog objekta manjih dimenzija, nego su na suprotnim pravcima svoga rasprostiranja ulazile u profile, pa ni mogućnosti determiniranja njihova prostornog opsega, a time ni mogućnosti interpretiranja njihove namjene nisu bile ništa bolje od onih koje su za slične for-

culture. This primarily refers to chipped and polished stone tools, and decorative items and tools made of bone. Pottery is equally abundant, representing all typical phenomena of the Danilo ceramography, with the exception of the painted ware documented only with individual examples with linear motifs. Rytha on four legs also belong to the standard Danilo repertory and they are well-represented with a number of fragments as well as individual examples of ithyphallic ceramic objects (Horvat, Vujević 2017).

As evident from the illustrations, there were two massive stone structures from the later part of the Impressed Ware deposit. One of them spread diagonally from the southwestern to north-eastern corner of block A, and the other covered the entire north-western part of the main research area. They did not enclose any space nor did they suggest existence of a certain smaller object but they penetrated into profiles in opposite directions of their spreading so that possibilities of determining their spatial scope and thence possibilities of interpreting their function were not any better than the ones obtained by Z. Brusić and A. Moore for similar formations. On the other hand, in comparison with identical or similar stone structures found in previous exca-



Plan 1 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; masivna kamena struktura
Plan 1 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; massive stone structures



Sl. 8 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; masivne kamene strukture

Fig. 8 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; massive stone structures

vations, these were more massive, more compact and suggested more comprehensive building procedure. Furthermore it was evident that these were two structures which despite their partial physical contact had their independent directions of spreading at least in one part suggesting a possibility of certain, if only short, chronological interval in their formation.

All these facts and questions opened therein, alongside mentioned massiveness and size of unearthed structures, hitherto unknown at the Neolithic sites in the eastern Adriatic region, imposed the need of targeted extension of the research area in order to increase the possibility of spatial and functional definition of the newly found and comparable structures recovered in the excavations by Z. Brusić (Brusić 2008: 42, Pl. II, 1–2; Fig. 5) i A. Moorea (Moore et al. 2007: 28, Fig. 2). However due to the fact that adjacent parcels which may have offered the best information in that regard, were used for growing perennial crops, possibilities of such extension were limited and achievable minimally only in the remaining area east of the area encompassed in the previous research. An additional research area (block A1) in length of 6 m and maximal possible width of 3 m was opened in the possible direction of spreading of uncovered constructions, in direct contact with previously excavated area 8 (Fig. 4).

Excavations in this extended area were conducted in 2011 and as expected all main results and stratigraphic relations determined in the previous year were confirmed: shallow pits dug in the prehistoric surface (Fig. 12),



Sl. 9 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; masivne kamene strukture

Fig. 9 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; massive stone structures



Sl. 10 Blok A: Danilska kultura; starija faza
Fig. 10 Block A: Danilo culture; earlier level



Sl. 11 Blok A: Danilska kultura; dio podnice kuće, starija faza
Fig. 11 Block A: Danilo culture; floor remains from the earlier level

macije imali Z. Brusić i A. Moore. S druge strane, u usporedbi s istovrsnim ili sličnim kamenim strukturama ustanovljenim na prethodnim iskopavanjima, ove su bile znatno masivnije, kompaktnije i stvarale dojam mnogo opsežnijega graditeljskog zahvata. Osim toga, bilo je očigledno da je riječ o dvije strukture koje unatoč svom djelomičnom fizičkom dodiru barem jednim dijelom imaju i svoje neovisne pravce rasprostiranja što sugerira i mogućnost stanovitog, makar i malog, vremenskog razmaka u njihovu nastajanju.

Sve te činjenice i pitanja koja su se u vezi s njima otvarala, uz već naglašenu masivnost i veličinu otkrivenih struktura, dosad nepoznatih na neolitičkim nalazištima na području istočnog Jadrana, neizbježno su nametale potrebu ciljanog proširivanja istraživačke površine kojom bi se povećala i mogućnost prostornog i funkcionalnog definiranja novootkrivenih i s njima usporedivih struktura ustanovljenih na iskopavanjima Z. Brusića (Brusić 2008: 42, T. II, 1–2; sl. 5) i A. Moorea (Moore et al. 2007: 28, sl. 2). Međutim, zbog činjenice da su neposredno susjedne parcele, koje bi u tom smislu mogle pružiti najbolje podatke, namijenjene uzgoju dugogodišnjih kultura, mogućnosti takvog proširivanja bile su krajnje limitirane i minimalno ostvarljive samo na preostaloj površini istočno od one obuhvaćene dotadašnjim istraživanjem. Na toj je površini, na projiciranom vjerojatnom pravcu pružanja otkrivenih konstrukcija, a izravno naslonjena na prethodno istraženu, otvorena dodatna površina (blok A1) u dužini od 6 m i maksimalno mogućoj širini od 3 m (sl. 4).

Istraživanje na toj proširenoj površini provedeno je tijekom 2011. i njime su, posve očekivano, potvrđeni svi osnovni rezultati i stratigrafski odnosi ustanovljeni iskopavanjem u prethodnoj godini:

- jame plitko ukopane u originalnu prapovijesnu površinu (sl. 12),
- tanak depozit ranog neolitika formiran na originalnoj prapovijesnoj površini, a u stratigrafskom i relativnokronološkom smislu povezan s jamama,
- produžetak masivne kamene konstrukcije položene na prethodno formirani dio depozita (sl. 13),
- mlađi dio depozita ranog neolitika s djelomično otkrivenim nadzemnim objektima (sl. 14),
- depozit srednjeg neolitika s ostacima nadzemnih objekata.

Međutim, kako ni proširivanje istraživačke površine u mogućim okvirima nije donijelo nikakav kvalitativan pomak u spoznavanju prostornog opsega i funkcionalnog karaktera otkrivenih masivnih konstrukcija, pa su sva pitanja koja su se u vezi s time postavljala ostala i dalje otvorena ili u području hipotetičnog, tijekom 2012. provedeno je geofizičko istraživanje metodama geoelektričnog otpora tla (Electrical Resistivity) i georadara (GPR – Ground Penetrating Radar System), kojim nije obuhvaćena samo parcela na kojoj je provedeno iskopavanje od 2010. do 2011., nego i danas nedostupne parcele na kojima je iskopavanje vodio Z. Brusić, kao i neistraživana parcela na istočnoj periferiji nalazišta.⁵ Kako su obje metode dale posve istovjetne rezultate, o nji-

thin deposit of the Early Neolithic formed on the original prehistoric surface, associated with the pits in terms of stratigraphy and relative chronology,

- extension of the massive stone construction laid on the previously formed part of the deposit (Fig. 13),
- later part of the Early Neolithic deposit with partially uncovered above-ground objects (Fig. 14),
- the deposit of the Middle Neolithic with the remains of the above-ground objects.

However since neither the extension of the research area within possible boundaries brought any qualitative advancement in understanding the spatial scope and functional character of the uncovered massive constructions so that all questions posed in that respect remained opened or hypothetical, in 2012 a geophysical survey was conducted using the methods of electrical resistivity and GPR (ground penetrating radar) system encompassing not only the plot excavated in 2010–2011, but also presently unavailable plots excavated by Z. Brusić. A previously unexcavated plot on the eastern periphery of the site was also included in the survey.⁵ Since both methods offered identical results, their reliability is out of doubt and unfortunately they cannot be compared with identical results from the research by A. Moore. The 2012 research offered following results:

- 1) Stone structures unearthed in the research area (block A) are only a small segment of a long arched formation visible all the way to the eastern periphery of the site, i.e. foot of the present-day village road,
- 2) Uncovered stone structures and their extensions on unexcavated areas are not the only formations of the kind at the site,
- 3) Identical, concentrically distributed massive structures with wider spatial scope exist at other parts of the site,
- 4) There were definitely at least four identical structures making a complex system which enclosed the Neolithic settlement 8 (Fig. 15).

There is no doubt that these results significantly improved understanding of the settlement in Pokrovnik. Although as early as the excavations in 2010 massiveness of the uncovered structures suggested that they might have been a part of the construction which enclosed the Early Neolithic settlement as interpreted by Z. Brusić, the number of identical formations on the other parts of the site was rather surprising, and it opened up two new questions unanswerable by geophysical survey. Firstly, it is the question of their mutual chronological relations, and secondly their positions in relation to the Early and Middle Neolithic settlement wholes. On the other hand, these insights opened up space for further aimed research.

On the basis of previous results and in view of new possibilities, an additional excavation was undertaken in 2013, on the trail of these possibilities. The excavation encompassed a compact surface of 100 m² (block B) at the part of the site immediately next to the village road which is situated

5 Geofizička istraživanja proveo je B. Mušič s Odjela za arheologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Ljubljani.

5 Geophysical surveys were conducted by B. Mušič from the Department of Archaeology of the Faculty of Philosophy in Ljubljana.



Sl. 12 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; plitke jame ukopane u zdravicu
Fig. 12 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; shallow pits dug into virgin soil



Sl. 13 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; masivna kamena struktura
Fig. 13 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; massive stone structure



Sl. 14 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; dio zida i podnice kuće
 Fig. 14 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; part of the wall and house floor

hovoj pouzdanosti nema nikakvih dvojbi i prava je štete što ih iz razloga koje sam naveo nije moguće usporediti s istovrsnim rezultatima s istraživanja A. Moorea. Istraživanje 2012. pokazalo je sljedeće:


- 1) kamene strukture otkrivene na istraživanoj površini (Blok A) samo su mali segment dugačke lučne formacije koja je vidljiva sve do istočne periferije nalazišta, odnosno podnožja današnjega seoskog puta,
- 2) otkrivene kamene strukture i njihovi produžetci na neistraženim površinama nisu jedine formacije te vrste na ovom nalazištu,
- 3) istovrsne, koncentrično raspoređene masivne strukture sa širim prostornim obuhvatom postoje i na ostalim dijelovima nalazišta,
- 4) sa sigurnošću se može računati s postojanjem najmanje četiri istovrsne strukture koje tvore složen sustav kojim je ograđeno neolitičko naselje (sl. 15).

Nema nikakve dvojbe da je ovim spoznajama učinjen značajan pomak u razumijevanju naselja u Pokrovniku. Naime, premda je masivnost otkrivenih struktura već nakon istraživanja 2010. sugerirala mogućnost da bi one mogle biti dio konstrukcije kojom je okruženo naselje ranog neolitika u smislu spomenute interpretacije Z. Brusića, broj istovrsnih

in the zone which marks the eastern periphery of the Neolithic settlement judging from the altitude relations and topographical and morphological characteristics (Fig. 14).

The deposit was very thin (about 30 cm) in the excavated area and limited to the humus and subhumus layer lying directly on the limestone bedrock (Fig. 16). In these circumstances it was impossible to determine any separate stratigraphic sequences on the larger part of the excavated surface, although individual Early Neolithic finds have been recovered alongside dominant Danilo finds. Only two definite stratigraphic wholes have been verified in the excavated area.

The first one consisted of the only uncovered object which took up southern half of the excavated surface, spreading roughly in east – west direction. It was a somewhat deeper ditch about 3 m long, about 130 cm wide, cut into limestone bedrock to the average depth of 50 cm (Fig. 16–17). The second stratigraphic unit consists of its leveling. Namely the ditch was filled with a layer of pebbles and earth. It contained only Middle Neolithic pottery and other finds (Fig. 18). Judging from the pottery finds from various depths which could be conjoined, it is more than likely that filling of the ditch was done systematically and in



Sl. 15 Geofizičko istraživanje: geoelektrični otpor tla
 Fig. 15 Geophysical prospecting: electrical resistivity

formacija na ostalim dijelovima nalazišta ipak je predstavljao stanovito iznenađenje, a otvorio je i dva nova pitanja na koja geofizička istraživanja ne mogu odgovoriti. Prvo, to je pitanje njihovih međusobnih vremenskih odnosa, a drugo, njihovih pozicija prema naseobinskim cjelinama ranog i srednjeg neolitika. S druge strane, te su spoznaje otvorile prostor daljnjem ciljanom istraživanju.

Slijedom prethodnih rezultata i novih mogućnosti, tijekom 2013. izvedeno je dodatno iskopavanje koje je bilo upravo na tragu tih mogućnosti. Iskopavanjem je obuhvaćena kompaktna površina od 100 m² (blok B) na dijelu nalazišta neposredno uz današnji seoski put koji je, sudeći na osnovi visinskih odnosa, topografskih karakteristika i morfoloških odlika, položen u zoni koja vjerojatno označava i istočnu periferiju neolitičkog naselja (sl. 14).

Na istraženju površini depozit je bio vrlo tanak – oko 30 cm – i zapravo ograničen na neposredno humusni i subhumusni sloj koji izravno leže na matičnoj vapnenačkoj stijeni (sl. 16). U tim okolnostima na većem dijelu istražene površine nije bilo moguće utvrditi nikakve izdvojene stratigrafske sekvence, premda su u prikupljenoj arheološkoj građi uz dominantne nalaze srednjeg zastupljeni i pojedinačni nalazi ranog neolitika. Na istraženju su površini verificirane samo dvije pouzdane stratigrafske cjeline.

Prvu je činio jedini otkriveni objekt koji je zauzimao južnu polovicu istražene površine, a protezao se približno pravcem istok – zapad. Riječ je o nešto dubljem rovu (kanalu) dužine oko 3 m, širine oko 130 cm, usječenom u matičnu vapnenačku stijenu do prosječne dubine od 50 cm (sl. 16–17). Drugu stratigrafsku cjelinu čini njegova nivelacija. Naime, rov je posve ispunjen slojem sitnijeg kamenja i zemlje, a sadržavao je isključivo keramičke i druge nalaze srednjeg neolitika (sl. 18). Sudeći prema keramičkim nalazima, među kojima je ulomke s različitih dubina bilo moguće međusobno fizički povezati i pripisati istima posudama, vrlo je vjerojatno da je zatrpavanje kanala provedeno planski i u jednom mahu. S obzirom na to, kao i na potpuni nedostatak nalaza koji bi pripadali ranom neolitu, vrlo je vjerojatno da je rov ukopan u vrijeme trajanja ranoneolitičkog naselja, te da zajedno s barem jednom od masivnih kamenih struktura s kojom je, sudeći prema rezultatima geofizičkih istraživanja izravno povezan, tvorio dio složenog sustava kojim je ono bilo omeđeno. Iz razloga na koje ću se vratiti u kasnijem izlaganju, rov je niveliran, pa je i njegova funkcija, ma kakva ona bila, time poništena.

Prikazani tijek iskopavanja, zajedno s predstavljenim nekim osnovnim rezultatima, već sami po sebi vrlo dobro ilustriraju posebnost prostorne organizacije i kompleksne strukture ovoga neolitičkog naselja, nepoznatih na drugim istodobnim nalazištima ovog područja, a očigledno uvjetovanih podudarnošću u obrascima razvojnih dinamika tijekom pojedinih etapa svoga trajanja faza: impresokeramičke i danilske. O tim će pitanjima biti više govora u kasnijem izlaganju, a ovdje bih se najprije zadržao na nekim pitanjima stratigrafskih odnosa, ne samo zbog njihove važnosti za razumijevanje unutarnje razvojne dinamike i funkcioniranja

one go. Therefore and having in mind complete lack of the Early Neolithic finds, it is very likely that the ditch was dug during the existence of the Early Neolithic settlement, and that it made a complex enclosure system of the settlement together with at least one of stone structures with which it was associated, according to the results of geophysical surveys. The ditch was leveled owing to causes I will refer to later on, so that its function, whatever it might have been, was annulled in that way.

Described course of excavations together with some of the main results presented are good illustrations of special spatial organization and complex structure of this Neolithic settlement, unknown at other synchronous sites from this region, evidently caused by correspondence in patterns of the developmental dynamics during separate stages of the Impressed Ware and Danilo phases. These questions will be addressed in continuation, but first I would like to pay attention to some questions of stratigraphic relations, not only because of their importance for understanding the inner developmental dynamics and functioning of the Neolithic settlement throughout its existence, but primarily because the existing literature does not offer quality information in that regard. Although there are no deviations in the basic stratigraphic course (Impressed Ware culture – Danilo culture), the existing details are neither precise enough nor comprehensive enough, and they are uneven. Z. Brusić offers no information indicating or at least suggesting existence of finer stratifications neither in earlier nor in later part of the deposit (Brusić 2008), while the information in this respect provided by A. Moore is quite sketchy: "The remains of the Impressed Ware settlement consisted of patches of stones and multiple layers of habitation debris, hearths and occasional pits..... The levels of this later village consisted again of dense occupation debris and traces of walls." (Moore et al. 2007: 28).

As opposed to this, facts obtained during the excavations from 2010 to 2011, and in 2013 are absolutely certain in that regard. As I have already mentioned, presence of two basic stratigraphic and relative chronological sequences was determined in the part of deposit formed during the Early Neolithic.

The first one consists of shallow pit objects dug into virgin soil and a thin deposit associated with these objects, formed directly on the same original surface, in the chronological range of their duration (Fig. 5; 12).

The second, later stratigraphic unit is far more complex, consisting of two massive stone structures and related remains of above-ground objects. Mutual chronological relations between the objects in the excavated area are clear as they result from laws of superposition so that three occupation levels can be defined on the basis of such relations. The first occupation level was defined directly on the thin deposit previously formed on the original surface, and it is well documented by a patch of floor and the belonging foundation zone of the wall construction formed of amorphous stone (Fig. 14). Remains of this object lie on previously formed deposit and they are spatially associated with one



Sl. 16 Blok B: Rov ranog neolitika
Fig. 16 Block B: Early Neolithic ditch



Sl. 17 Blok B: Rov ranog neolitika
Fig. 17 Block B: Early Neolithic ditch



Sl. 18 Blok B: Srednjeneolitička nivelacija jarka ranog neolitika
 Fig. 18 Block B: Middle Neolithic leveling of the Early Neolithic ditch

neolitičkog naselja tijekom čitavog njegova trajanja, nego u prvom redu zbog toga što u postojećoj literaturi o tome nema kvalitetnih podataka. Naime, premda u osnovnom stratigrafskom slijedu ustanovljenom pri svim iskopavanjima (impresokeramička – danijska kultura), nema nikakvih odstupanja, postojeći podaci nisu ni dovoljno precizni ni iscrpni, niti su ujednačeni. Među informacijama koje u tom smislu donosi Z. Brusić nema onih koje bi sigurno upućivale ili barem sugerirale postojanje i finijih uslojavanja bilo u starijem bilo u mlađem dijelu depozita (Brusić 2008), dok su danas dostupni podatci koje sa svojih iskopavanja o tome donosi A. Moore krajnje sumarni: “The remains of the Impressed Ware settlement consisted of patches of stones and multiple layers of habitation debris, hearths and occasional pits (...) The levels of this later village consisted again of dense occupation debris and traces of walls.” (Moore et al. 2007: 28).

Nasuprot tomu, činjenice ustanovljene tijekom iskopavanja od 2010. do 2011. te 2013. u tom su smislu nedvojbene. Kako sam već spomenuo, u dijelu depozita formiranog tijekom ranog neolitika nedvojbeno je ustanovljeno postojanje dviju osnovnih stratigrafskih i relativnokronoloških sekvenci.

Prvu čine jamski objekti plitko ukopani u zdravicu i s njima povezan tanak depozit formiran izravno na istoj prvotnoj površini, a u vremenskom rasponu njihova trajanja (sl. 5; 12).

of two massive stone structures – the one laid in the diagonal of block A – ending along its inner face so it is almost certain that they make one stratigraphic and chronological unit with it (Fig. 13).

A far more complex question refers to chronological relations of the house remains from later occupation levels from the Early Neolithic and massive stone structures, and in particular of mutual chronological relations of the stone structures. As direct stratigraphic and therefore chronological relation between the stone structures cannot be determined, we need to define it indirectly, through mutual relations of object remains and position they take in relation to later stone structures (Fig. 19–20). As evident from the illustration, two later occupation levels in this stratigraphic sequence were documented by the remains of two superimposed floors providing in that way their clear chronological relation. At the same time the earlier floor superimposes one of two massive structures – the one lying in the diagonal of block A – offering clear chronological framework for these structures. However that same floor ends next to the inner face of another structure – the one closer to the outer part of the same block – so it should be close to it in terms of chronology and make a coeval whole with it. This floor and related stone structure are overlaid by the previously mentioned later floor which at the same time documents the latest occupation level in the excavated area, and represents the latest stratification element in this series. These

Druga, mlađa stratigrafska sekvenca znatno je složenija, a čine je dvije masivne kamene strukture i s njima povezani ostatci nadzemnih nastambi. Međusobni vremenski odnosi nastambi na istraženom prostoru posve su jasni jer proizlaze iz odnosa superpozicije, pa je na osnovi takvih odnosa moguće fiksirati ukupno tri razine stanovanja. Prva razina stanovanja ustanovljena je neposredno na tankom depozitu prethodno formiranom na prvotnoj površini, a dobro je dokumentirana dijelom podnice i pripadajućom temeljnom zonom zidne konstrukcije formirane od amorfnog kamena (sl. 14). Ostatci te nastambe leže na prethodno formiranom depozitu, prostorno su povezani s jednom od dviju masivnih kamenih struktura – onom položenom po dijagonali Bloka A – a završavaju uza samo njezino unutarnje lice, pa je gotovo posve sigurno da s njim čine stratigrafsku i vremensku cjelinu (sl. 13).

Znatno je složenije pitanje vremenskih odnosa ostataka nastambi iz mlađih razina stanovanja ranog neolitika i masivnih kamenih struktura, a posebno međusobnih vremenskih odnosa kamenih struktura. Kako izravan stratigrafski, a time i vremenski, odnos između kamenih struktura nije moguće utvrditi, potrebno ga je odrediti posredno i to preko međusobnih odnosa ostataka nastambi i položaja koji one zauzimaju prema kamenim strukturama (sl. 19–20). Naime, kao što je na priloženoj ilustraciji vidljivo, dvije mlađe razine stanovanja u ovoj stratigrafskoj sekvenci dokumentirane su ostacima dviju superponiranih podnica, pa iz toga proizlazi i njihov posve jasan vremenski odnos. Starija podnica istodobno preslojava jednu od dviju masivnih struktura – onu položenu po dijagonali Bloka A – čime je i njihov vremenski odnos posve jasno i sigurno određen. Ista ta podnica, međutim, završava uz unutarnje lice druge strukture – one bliže vanjskom dijelu istog bloka – pa bi s njom morala stajati u bliskom vremenskom odnosu i formirati sinkronu cjelinu. Tu podnicu i s njom povezanu kamenu strukturu preslojava prethodno spomenuta mlađa podnica koja istodobno dokumentira najmlađu razinu stanovanja na istraženoj površini, a u ovoj seriji predstavlja najmlađi element stratifikacije. Iz tih odnosa posve jasno proizlazi i vremenski odnos između dviju kamenih struktura u kojem se ona položena po dijagonali Bloka A iskazuje kao starija pojava. S obzirom na to, cjelinu vremenskih odnosa u ovoj stratigrafskoj sekvenci u pojednostavljenom je obliku moguće prikazati na sljedeći način.

Od ukupno tri ustanovljene razine stanovanja u mlađem dijelu depozita impresokeramičke kulture, dvije starije povezane su s masivnim kamenim strukturama koje određuju opseg naseobinskih površina kojima pripadaju i navedene podnice, dok za najmlađu razinu stanovanja takva povezanost s kamenim strukturama na istraženoj površini nije dokumentirana, što znači da nijedna od njih ne definira ukupnu naseobinsku površinu kojoj ona pripada. Međutim, kako sve ove razine stanovanja s masivnim kamenim strukturama pripadaju mlađoj vremenskoj sekvenci ranoneolitičkog naselja, ovdje treba dodati i onu ranije opisanu razinu s ukopanim objektima bez kamenih struktura, što znači da su na naselju ranog neolitika postojale ukupno četiri razine stanovanja: incijalna s ukopanim objektima i bez masivnih

relations offer a good illustration of chronological relation between two stone structures in which the one laid in the diagonal of block A is recognized as an earlier formation. Therefore chronological relations in this stratigraphic sequence can be illustrated in a simplified way as follows.

Out of three defined occupation levels in the later part of the deposit of the Impresoso Ware culture, two earlier ones were related to the massive stone structures determining the scope of settlement areas which include the mentioned floors, while such association with the stone structures was not confirmed for the latest occupation level in the excavated area meaning that none of them defines entire settlement area to which it belongs. However as all these occupation levels with massive stone structures belong to the later sequence of the Early Neolithic settlement, we need to add previously described level with dug in objects without stone structures meaning that there were four occupation levels altogether: the initial one with dug in objects and without massive stone structures, and three with above-ground objects and massive stone structures illustrating later development. Mentioned facts are important not only for determining chronological relations of the stratification elements but also for understanding developmental dynamics of the Early Neolithic settlements and their interpretation. From all the aforementioned it is clear that the Early Neolithic settlement did not have several simultaneous massive arched constructions but they were built successively negating one another. This will be elaborated in the further discussion.

Stratigraphic sequence of the Middle Neolithic in the excavated area is much simpler primarily due to lack of massive structures which were completely overlaid by the Middle Neolithic deposit and remains of the belonging houses whose parts lie on the surfaces encompassed by massive stone structures in the Early Neolithic. However owing to intensive postdepositional processes, that is soil cultivation taking up to 30 cm of the upper part of deposit at places, total number of occupation levels in the Middle Neolithic cannot be determined precisely. Two have been defined with certainty, but it is clear that another occupation level had to be present in the damaged part. Except for being stratigraphically apart, these two occupation levels differ in some technical procedures applied in the construction of houses. Floors of the houses from the earlier occupation level make compact surfaces of packed earth while those in the objects from the later phase were made of rammed pebbles (Fig. 10–11; 21–25).

THE EARLY NEOLITHIC SETTLEMENT

As already mentioned, the first settlement in Pokrovnik consisted solely of objects dug shallowly in the original surface. Since none of them was excavated completely, their ground plans cannot be defined precisely but they seem to be quite irregular. Their sizes cannot be discussed for the same reasons. There were no hearth remains or any other structures in the excavated parts so their interior leaves an impression of modesty and brevity. However a number of



Sl. 19 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; masivne kamene strukture i podovi kuća: stratigrafski odnosi
Fig. 19 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; massive stone structures and house floors: stratigraphic relations



Sl. 20 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; masivne kamene strukture i podovi kuća: stratigrafski odnosi
Fig. 20 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; massive stone structures and house floors: stratigraphic relations

kamenih struktura, te tri s nadzemnim objektima i masivnim kamenim strukturama koje ilustriraju kasniji razvoj. Navedene činjenice nisu važne samo zbog utvrđivanja vremenskih odnosa elemenata stratifikacije nego i za razumijevanje razvojne dinamike naselja ranog neolitika i njihovo interpretiranje. Naime, iz navedenoga je jasno razvidno da ranoneolitičko naselje nije imalo više istodobnih lučno raspoređenih masivnih konstrukcija nego su one sukcesivno podizane i međusobno su se negirale. To će biti vidljivo u daljnjem izlaganju.

Stratigrafska sekvenca srednjeg neolitika na istraženoj površini znatno je jednostavnija i to u prvom redu zbog nedostatka masivnih struktura koje su posve preslojene srednjoneolitičkim depozitom i ostacima njemu pripadajućih nastambi, čiji dijelovi mjestimice leže na površinama koje su u ranom neolitiku zauzimale masivne kamene strukture. Međutim, zbog intenzivnih postdepozicijskih procesa, odnosno poljodjelskih aktivnosti koje su mjestimice obuhvatile i preko 30 cm gornjeg dijela depozita, ukupan broj razina stanovanja u srednjem neolitiku nije moguće pouzdano ustanoviti. Sigurno su ustanovljene dvije, ali je posve jasno da je u oštećenom dijelu morala postojati barem još jedna razina stanovanja. Osim što su stratigrafski razdvojene, te dvije razine stanovanja razlikuju se i prema nekim tehničkim postupcima primijenjenim pri podizanju nastambi. Podnice nastambi iz starije razine stanovanja čine kompaktne površine s nabijenom zemljom, dok su one u nastambama iz mlađe faze formirane od sloja sitnoga nabijenog kamena (sl. 10–11; 21–25).

NASELJE RANOG NEOLITIKA

Kao što je već ranije naglašeno, prvo naselje na Pokrovniku sastojalo se isključivo od objekata plitko ukopanih u prvotnu površinu. S obzirom na to da nijedan nije obuhvaćen u cjelini, o njihovim tlorisima nije moguće dati precizne podatke, ali čini se da je riječ o posve nepravilnim oblicima. Iz istih razloga nije moguće govoriti ni o njihovim veličinama. U istraženim dijelovima nisu ustanovljeni ostaci ognjišta niti kakvih drugih zahvata i opreme, pa njihova unutrašnjost odaje vrlo skromnu sliku i ostavlja dojam izrazite kratkotrajnosti. Međutim, unutar objekata ustanovljeno je više dosta pravilnih kružnih jama koje bi morale odgovarati ležištima prilično čvrstih nosača nadzemne konstrukcije. To se posebno odnosi na one raspoređene po rubovima objekata ili neposredno uz njih. Sudeći prema njihovim oblicima i okomitim stijenkama, većina ležišta pripadala je okomito postavljenim stupovima, ali kako je uz njih ustanovljeno i nekoliko jama s kosim stijenkama, čini se da se gornja konstrukcija oslanjala na okomito i ukoso postavljene nosače. Međutim, mogući izgled te konstrukcije ostaje izvan domaćaja sigurnije prosudbe (sl. 5; 7; 12; plan 2).

Veličinu toga prvoga naselja nije moguće sigurnije odrediti, ali je vjerojatno da nije zauzimalo bitno veću površinu od one koju određuje starija od dvije otkrivene kamene konstrukcije i podnožje brijega ispod kojeg je naselje podignuto, a koji zatvara istočni rub polja na tom njegovu dijelu.


regular round postholes were found in the object which correspond to holes of rather firm structural supports of the above-ground construction. This refers in particular to the ones distributed on the edges of the object or immediately next to them. Judging from their forms and vertical walls, most postholes belonged to vertical posts, but since several pits with oblique walls were found next to them, it seems that the upper construction was supported by vertical and slanted supports. Possible look of this construction remains hypothetical (Fig. 5; 7; 12; Plan 2).

The size of this first settlement cannot be determined precisely, but it probably did not take up much larger area than the one defined by the earlier of two uncovered stone constructions and the foot of the hill under which the settlement was founded, closing the eastern edge of the field in this part. The oldest part of the deposit with an average thickness of deposit of about 10 cm belongs to this initial settlement in Pokrovnik. Such modest deposit clearly illustrates brevity of the initial settlement, and on the other hand it supports impression of modesty of shallow objects as very temporary objects. In all likelihood the oldest settlement in Pokrovnik marks the very moment of occupying the settlement area and elementary stabilization at that place. Foundation of the settlement can be dated to 5630 cal BC (7580 cal BP).⁶

Full stabilization of the Early Neolithic settlement in Pokrovnik is illustrated by later occupation levels with above-ground objects distributed in the settlement area which is defined naturally by the foot of the hill on the eastern side, and on the western side by arched stone constructions. Such settlement with above-ground houses was documented with three occupation levels.

The first occupation level in the settlement conceived in that way was defined by the earlier stone construction and topography of natural environment, and it was documented by stone construction remains and remains of houses. Although the construction and remains of houses lie on the same deposit formed during the existence of the initial settlement, preventing in that way precise definition of their mutual chronological relations, it is likely that the stone construction had certain temporal priority in relation to houses. Namely I believe that its formation started while the initial settlement with dug in objects was still functioning in order to complete the settlement area and create conditions for definite stabilization of the settlement. Construction of the above-ground houses, that is formation of the later settlement happened immediately afterwards, and possibly also parallelly with this basic construction procedure. Such course of activities is quite natural primarily because making of stone construction is a collective act which demands inclusion of all community members regardless of the nature of construction. On the other hand individual houses, demanding a simpler building procedure, could have been built successively after the completion of the basic bu-

6 (Beta-293239) – conventional dates: 6700±40 BP; 2 sigma calibrated range (95%): 5670 to 5550 cal BC (7620 to 7500 cal BP); 1 sigma calibrated range (68%): 5640 to 5620 cal BC (7590 to 7560 cal BP).



Plan 2 Blok A: Impresokeramička kultura; tloris plitko ukopanog objekta u zdravicu
Plan 2 Block A: Impressed Ware culture; ground plan of a shallow pit dug into virgin soil

Tom inicijalnom naselju na Pokrovniku pripada i najstariji dio depozita čija debljina varira, ali prosječno doseže oko 10 cm. Tako skroman depozit vrlo jasno ilustrira kratkotrajnost inicijalnog naselja, a s druge strane podupire i dojam o skromnosti plitko ukopanih objekata kao posve privremenih nastambi. Po svemu sudeći, najstarije naselje na Pokrovniku označava sam trenutak zauzimanja naseobinskog prostora i njegove elementarne stabilizacije na tom mjestu. Osnivanje toga naselja moguće je datirati oko 5630. god. pr. Kr. (7580. god. pr. sad.).⁶

Punu stabilizaciju ranoneolitičkog naselja na Pokrovniku označavaju mlađe razine stanovanja s nadzemnim objektima raspoređenim na naseobinskoj površini koja je na istočnoj strani prirodno određena podnožjem brijega uz koji je naselje podignuto, a na zapadnoj sukcesivno podizanim lučnim kamenim konstrukcijama. Tako formirano naselje s nadzemnim nastambama na istraženoj površini dokumentirano je trima razinama stanovanja.

Prva razina stanovanja u tako koncipiranom naselju prostorno je određena starijom kamenom konstrukcijom i topografijom prirodnog okruženja, a dokumentirana ostatcima kamene konstrukcije i ostatcima nastambi. Premda i konstrukcija i ostatci nastambi leže na istom depozitu formiranom tijekom trajanja inicijalnog naselja, zbog čega njihove međusobne vremenske odnose nije moguće sasvim egzaktno utvrditi, vrlo je vjerojatno da kamena konstrukcija ima stanoviti vremenski prioritet pred nastambama. Naime, smatram da je njezino formiranje započelo još za trajanja inicijalnog naselja s ukopanim objektima kako bi se time naseobinska površina posve zaokružila i na taj način stvorili uvjeti za definitivno stabiliziranje naselja. Podizanje nadzemnih nastambi, odnosno formiranje mlađeg naselja provedeno je neposredno nakon toga, a moguće i dijelom uspooredno s tim osnovnim graditeljskim zahvatom. Takav slijed aktivnosti posve je prirodan ponajprije zbog toga što je formiranje kamene konstrukcije očigledan kolektivni čin koji, kao zajednička potreba neovisno o njezinoj prirodi, sam po sebi podrazumijeva uključenost svih članova zajednice. S druge strane, individualne nastambe koje u konstruktivnom smislu predstavljaju jednostavniji zahvat, mogle su biti podizane sukcesivno nakon dovršetka toga osnovnog graditeljskog cilja. Međutim, s obzirom na veličinu istraživačke površine, samo parcijalno otkrivene nastambe, te druge okolnosti u njihovim odnosima prema kamenim konstrukcijama, ovdje nije moguće dati iscrpnije podatke ni o nastambama na ovoj razini stanovanja. Ipak, posve je sigurno da je riječ o objektima pravokutnih ili/i kvadratnih tlorisa s podovima od tvrdo nabijene zemlje izmiješane s velikom količinom vapnenca uglavnom sitne granulacije, zbog čega i njihovi presjeci i površine imaju svijetlosivu nijansu, izrazito kontrastnu prema površinama izvan nastambi (sl. 13–14). Uz rub podnice jednog od tih objekata ustanovljen je pravilan niz amorfno kamenja koji bi mogao predstavljati temeljnu osnovu gornje konstrukcije nastambe (sl. 13–14). Međutim, o načinu formiranja njezinih gornjih dijelova i njihovu izgledu

ilding aim. However considering the size of excavated area, only partially uncovered houses, and other circumstances in their relations to the stone constructions, we cannot offer any more thorough information on the houses or this occupation level. However it is quite certain that the objects had square and/or rectangular ground plans with floors made of packed earth mixed with large amount of rather small limestone particles giving light grey tone to floor sections and surfaces, in sharp contrast with the surfaces outside the houses (Fig. 13–14). A regular row of amorphous stones was found next to the edge of one object's floor which may have been a base of the upper construction of the object (Fig. 13–14). However it is difficult to offer any precise information on its upper parts and their look. Perhaps small amount of daub recovered in very small pieces might be indicative in that sense.

The following occupation level is characterized primarily by an increase of the existing spatial scope of the settlement, that is its expansion towards west and north-west, documented by construction of a new arched construction alongside simultaneous negation of function of the previously built construction. Although it has been explicitly stated in presentation of mutual stratigraphic relations, we need to emphasize once more that these were two independent constructions in functional terms, so that building of the new construction should not be associated with the previous one. New construction does not refer to extending or reinforcing of the earlier one, it completely negated and took over the function it had. Superimposing of the earlier construction with the floor of the later one fits into this context of mutual functional relations of two constructions as this circumstance clearly defines not only the basic but also the only reason of increasing the spatial scope of the site: expansion of its settlement capacity caused by population growth of the community.

It is almost certain that this later occupation level introduced no important changes in the basic building concept, as the remains of houses were recognized on the basis of identical elements as the ones from the previous occupation level. At this level of exploration it refers primarily to the corresponding way of floor formation and exceptionally small amounts of daub without compact and large pieces.

Finally the latest occupation level determined in the excavated area marks further increase of spatial scope of the settlement, that is expansion of the area for building houses. This process, just like in the previous phase, was documented by the floor of a house taking up the area of the later stone construction which it negates functionally.

Further rhythm in the dynamics of the spatial development of the Early Neolithic settlement and its total spatial scope cannot be presented here with certainty because excavations conducted from 2010 to 2013 do not offer firm strongholds therein. On the basis of information from Z. Brusić's excavations this settlement had to spread on the plot west of the excavated one (Brusić 2008: 8–9), and geophysical prospections undoubtedly confirm presence of several massive stone constructions encompassing this part of the site. In that regard it is justified to assume that

6 (Beta-293239) – Konvencionalni datum: 6700±40 BP; 2 sigma kalibrirani datum (95%): 5670. do 5550. god. pr. Kr. (7620. do 7500. god. pr. sad.); 1 sigma kalibrirani datum (68%): 5640. do 5620. god. pr. Kr. (7590. do 7560. god. pr. sad.).

du nije moguće iznijeti preciznije podatke. U tom je smislu možda indikativan podatak o izrazito maloj količini kućnog lijepa pronađenog u posve sitnim komadima.

Sljedeća razina stanovanja označava prije svega povećanje postojećega prostornog opsega naselja, odnosno njegovo proširivanje prema zapadu i sjeverozapadu, što je dokumentirano izgradnjom nove lučne konstrukcije uz istodobno negiranje funkcije one prethodno izgrađene. Premda je to jasno navedeno pri iznošenju međusobnih stratigrafskih odnosa, ovdje je potrebno još jednom naglasiti da je riječ o dvije funkcionalno posve neovisne konstrukcije, pa podizanje nove ne treba nikako povezivati s onom prethodnom. Nova konstrukcija nije proširivanje ili pojačavanje one starije nego njezino potpuno negiranje i preuzimanje funkcije koju je ona imala. U taj kontekst međusobnih funkcionalnih odnosa dviju konstrukcija posve se uklapa i preslojavanje starije konstrukcije podnicom mlađe nastambe, jer ta okolnost sama po sebi posve jasno određuje ne samo temeljni nego i jedini razlog povećavanja prostornog opsega nalazišta: proširivanje njegova stambenog kapaciteta uvjetovanog populacijskim povećanjem zajednice.

Gotovo je posve sigurno da ta mlađa stambena razina nije unijela nikakve bitne promjene u osnovnoj graditeljskoj koncepciji, jer su ostatci nastambi ustanovljeni na temelju istih elemenata kao i one iz prethodno stambene razine. Na ovoj razini istraženosti to se primarno odnosi na podudaran način formiranja podnica i izrazito malu količinu kućnog lijepe bez kompaktnih i krupnijih komada.

Napokon, najmlađa razina stanovanja ustanovljena na istraženju površini označava daljnje povećavanje prostornog opsega naselja, odnosno proširivanje prostora za podizanje nastambi. Taj je proces, jednako kao i u prethodnoj, dokumentiran podnicom nastambe koja zauzima površinu mlađe kamene konstrukcije i funkcionalno je potpuno negira.

Daljnji ritam u dinamici prostornog razvoja ranoneolitičkog naselja i njegov ukupan prostorni opseg ovdje nije moguće sigurno prikazati jer za to iskapanja od 2010. do 2013. ne pružaju dovoljno uporišta. Ipak, na osnovi podataka s iskapanja Z. Brusića to je naselje moralo zauzimati i parcelu zapadno od one na kojoj je provedeno ovo iskapanje (Brusić 2008: 8–9), a geofizičke prospekcije nedvojbeno potvrđuju postojanje više masivnih kamenih konstrukcija koje obuhvaćaju i taj dio nalazišne cjeline. S obzirom na to, opravdano je pretpostaviti da je naselje ranog neolitika sukcesivno povećavano te da je to prostorno širenje uključivalo podizanje novih kamenih konstrukcija uz istodobno negiranje onih prethodno podignutih. Drugim riječima, u ukupnosti razvojnih dinamika ranoneolitičkog naselja na Pokrovniku sve masivne kamene konstrukcije ilustriraju ritam njegova širenja i prostornog povećavanja. Drugo je pitanje njihove stvarne funkcije i razloga podizanja. Na ta ću se pitanja vratiti u kasnijem izlaganju, a ovdje bih se zadržao na već citiranom mišljenju A. Moorea o zidovima u funkciji terasa ili graničnih zidova manjega prostornog obuhvata (Moore et al. 2007: 28). S obzirom na primijenjenu strategiju istraživanja više malih površina, posve je razumljiva mogućnost pogrešne procjene opsega i funkcionalnog

the Early Neolithic settlement was enlarged successively and that this spatial increase included erecting new stone constructions alongside simultaneous negation of the previous ones. In other words in the total of developmental dynamics of the Early Neolithic site in Pokrovnik all massive stone constructions illustrate rhythm of its spreading and spatial increase. Question of their actual function and reason of building is quite another matter. I will get back to these questions in upcoming discussion, but first I would like to pay attention to previously cited opinion of A. Moore about walls functioning as terraces or boundary walls of smaller spatial scope (Moore et al. 2007: 28). Considering the applied research strategy concentrating on several smaller areas, it is understandable that there might have been incorrect estimates of the scope and functional character of the parts of stone construction uncovered in that period as limited excavated area reduced possibilities of their complete spatial perspective. The excavations conducted from 2010 to 2011 and in 2013 together with geophysical prospections clearly illustrate spatiality and multiple concentric distribution of stone constructions which deny mentioned interpretation. However opinion on walls functioning as terraces is a bit surprising in this interpretation. Assumption on presence of terraces must imply existence of irregular microrelief, i.e. more pronounced altitude differences at certain segments of the settlement area which impose or enable the need to be overcome. Absence of altitude differences makes terraced shaping of the space not only pointless but also impossible. On the other hand any terraced shaping should be permanently recorded at least in minimal scope. However present-day surface of the site is almost completely horizontal, and very slight and even fall is present only on its western periphery so that some earlier terraced shaping in such topographical situation cannot be discerned. There are no topographical irregularities on the original surface and both uncovered stone structures were laid on the same level so that these facts do not support hypothesis of terraced shaping of space. Finally archaeological deposit as a whole or in its sequences does not support process of terraced deposition which should be visible in various conditions of spatial disposition. Considering all the aforementioned it seems that recovered constructions make a part of more complex system of spatial enclosure of the Early Neolithic site executed rhythmically in accordance with increase of its scope.

THE MIDDLE NEOLITHIC SETTLEMENT

The Middle Neolithic settlement is far less complex than the earlier one. The main reason therein is the fact that there were no massive structures similar to the ones from the Early Neolithic part of the deposit. This does not mean that the later settlement did not have a similar system, only that at the present stage of exploration we must leave this question open. However its absence in the excavated area indicates that the Middle Neolithic settlement from the beginning of its existence covered much larger area than the one taken by the Early Neolithic one in its developmental dynamics, or in other words that its spatial scope probably

karaktera tada otkrivenih dijelova kamenih konstrukcija, jer je ograničena istraživačka površina bitno smanjivala mogućnost njihova sagledavanje u prostoru. Istraživanja provedena od 2010. do 2011. i 2013. zajedno s geofizičkim prospekcijama posve jasno pokazuju svu prostornost i višestruk koncentričan raspored kamenih konstrukcija koje potpuno opovrgavaju citiranu interpretaciju. Međutim, ono što pomalo iznenađuje u toj interpretaciji jest mišljenje o zidovima u funkciji terasa. Naime, pretpostavka o postojanju terasa mora podrazumijevati i postojanje nepravilnog mikroljelja, odnosno naglašenijih visinskih razlika na pojedinim dijelovima naseobinske površine koje nameću potrebu njihova svladavanja ili je samo omogućuju. Odsutnost visinskih razlika terasasto oblikovanje prostora ne čini samo besmislenim nego i nemogućim. S druge strane, svako terasasto oblikovanje površine moralo bi ostati trajno vidljivo barem u minimalnom opsegu. Međutim, današnja površina nalazišta gotovo je posve vodoravna, a vrlo blagi i posve ujednačen pad postoji samo prema njegovoj zapadnoj periferiji, pa u takvoj topografskoj slici neko ranije terasasto oblikovanje nije moguće ni naslutiti. Nikakvih topografskih nepravilnost nema ni na prvotnoj površini, a obje otkrivene kamene strukture položene su na istu razinu, pa ni te činjenice ne idu u prilog tvrdnji o bilo kakvom terasastom oblikovanju prostora. Napokon, ni arheološki depozit u cjelini, a ni u pojedinim svojim sekvencama, ne podržava proces terasastog odlaganja što bi svakako moralo biti vidljivo pri različitim uvjetima prostorne dispozicije. S obzirom na sve izloženo, očigledno je da otkrivene konstrukcije čine dio složenijeg sustava prostornog okruživanja naselja ranog neolitika provedenog ritmično u skladu s povećavanjem njegova opsega.

NASELJE SREDNJEG NEOLITIKA

Naselje srednjeg neolitika ni izdaleka ne djeluje tako kompleksno kao ono starije. Tomu je osnovni razlog činjenica što na istraženom površini nisu otkrivene nikakve masivne strukture slične onim iz ranoneolitičkog dijela depozita. Razumije se, ta činjenica sama po sebi nikako ne znači da mlađe naselje nije uopće imalo neki sličan sustav, ali na ovoj razini istraženosti to pitanje mora ostati posve otvoreno. Međutim, njegova odsutnost na istraženom prostoru pokazuje da je naselje srednjeg neolitika od početka svoga trajanja zauzimalo znatno veću površinu od one koju je u svojim razvojnim dinamikama zauzimalo naselje ranog neolitika, odnosno da je njegov prostorni opseg vrlo vjerojatno podudaran s opsegom naselja ranog neolitika na kraju njegova razvoja. To je posve prirodno s obzirom na to da u depozitu Pokrovnika nema nikakvih naznaka koje bi upućivale na privremeno napuštanje i ponovno zauzimanje iste pozicije. S druge strane, nivelacija ranoneolitičkog rova na istočnom stjenovitom rubu naselja posve jasno ukazuje na stanovite zahvate poduzete zbog optimiziranja naseobinskog prostora i njegova racionalnog korištenja. Nasip kojim je rov ispunjen posve je ujednačen, nalazi isključivo danijske keramike posve jasno određuju vremenski okvir u kojem je to prove-

corresponded to the scope of the Early Neolithic settlement at the end of its development. This is quite natural since there are no signs in the Pokrovnik deposit that might indicate to temporary leaving and resettling at the same position. On the other hand, leveling of the Early Neolithic ditch in the eastern rocky edge of the settlement clearly indicates to certain procedures undertaken in order to optimize the settlement area and use it rationally. Fill in the ditch is very uniform, finds of only Danilo pottery clearly designate chronological framework of this action and both these facts eliminate possibility of existence of some chronological range in which the settlement might have been abandoned, all the more so since the Early Neolithic ditch provided no traces of consequences of natural processes that might have been active in the period when this area was not used.

Development of the Middle Neolithic settlement was documented by partially preserved remains of houses and parts of their interior which represent two occupation levels. In relation to four occupation levels from the Early Neolithic this is an important difference. However, here it has only relative importance, because the upper part of the Middle Neolithic deposit was disturbed by long-term soil cultivation, preventing possible recognition of houses and other objects which definitely existed in this part of the deposit.

Segments of floors of two houses, probably of rectangular form were found in the earlier occupation level found in block A. Their floors were formed in a similar way as the Early Neolithic floors, using hard-packed earth whose consistency corresponds to the Early Neolithic floors but earth of different consistency was also used. Therefore neither their surfaces nor sections have the light tone characteristic of the floors in the Early Neolithic houses (Fig. 10–11; 21–22). One of them had larger patches of burnt earth but they could not be associated with hearth remains. A deep pit of quite regular round form with several large pieces of broken stone was found on the same surface. Probably it was a posthole as suggested by stone pieces which may have been used for fixing it in the floor, but its possible constructive function is not clear (Fig. 22).

These two floors are separated by quite wide area covered with great amount of small amorphous stones which seems to be more than just an area between the houses, it looks like an area intended for communication between them. Such possibility is suggested by its width, and even more by rammed layer of pebbles so compact as to reveal intention of forming a walking surface. If this really was an area intended for communication in the settlement, then it might indicate existence of a certain form of communal organization in which objects were not built freely but they were distributed in accordance with a defined pattern (Plan 3).

Later occupation level is documented by remains of houses which almost definitely follow planimetric relations of houses from the previous occupation level, but different technical procedure was applied in construction of their floors, and other materials were used. Namely house floors

deno, a obje te činjenice otklanjaju mogućnost postojanja nekoga vremenskog raspona u kojem bi naselje bilo napušteno. To tim više što u rovu ranog neolitika nema nikakvih naznaka o posljedicama prirodnih procesa koji bi djelovali tijekom razdoblja u kojem taj prostor nije bio korišten.

Razvoj srednjoneolitičkog naselja dokumentiran je djelomice sačuvanim ostatcima nastambi i dijelova njihova enterijera koji predočavaju dvije razine stanovanja. U odnosu na četiri stambene razine ranog neolitika, to je značajna razlika. Međutim, ona ovdje ima krajnje relativno značenje jer je gornji dio srednjoneolitičkog depozita posve poremećen dugogodišnjim poljodjelskim aktivnostima i ne pruža mogućnost prepoznavanja nastambi i drugih objekata koje su u tom njegovu dijelu zasigurno postojale.

U starijoj stambenoj razini ustanovljenoj u Bloku A otkriveni su dijelovi podnica dviju nastambi vjerojatno pravokutnog oblika. Njihove su podnice formirane na sličan način kao i podnice nastambi ranog neolitika, a uz čvrsto nabijenu zemlju čija je konzistencija slična podnicama ranog neolitika korištena je i zemlja drukčije konzistencije. Zbog toga ni njihove površine ni presjeci nemaju svijetli ton karakterističan za podnice u nastambama ranog neolitika (sl. 10–11; sl. 21–22). Na jednoj od njih iskazivale su se veće površine zapečene zemlje, ali ih nije bilo moguće povezati s ostatcima ognjišta. Na istoj površini ustanovljena je dublja jama dosta pravilnoga kružnog oblika s više krupnijih komada lomljenog kamena. Vjerojatno je riječ o ležištu stupa, što sugeriraju i komadi kamena koji su mogli poslužiti pri njegovu fiksiranju u podnicu, ali njegova moguća konstruktivna funkcija nije jasna (sl. 22).

Te dvije podnice razdvaja dosta široka površina pokrivena velikom količinom sitnoga amorfnog kamenja, koja ovdje ne djeluje samo kao prostor između nastambi nego kao prostor planski namijenjen za komuniciranje između njih. Takvu mogućnost sugerira već i njezina širina ali još i više čvrsto nabijen sloj sitnog kamenja koji svojom kompaktnošću odaje namjeru formiranja hodne površine. Ako je doista riječ o prostoru namijenjenom za komuniciranje kroz naselje, onda bi to moglo značiti i postojanje stanovitog oblika komunalne organizacije u kojoj nastambe nisu podizane posve slobodno nego su raspoređene prema utvrđenom obrascu (plan 3).

Mlađa stambena razina dokumentirana je ostatcima nastambi koje gotovo sigurno slijede planimetrijske obrasce nastambi iz prethodne stambene razine, ali je pri izgradnji njihovih podnica primijenjen drukčiji tehnički postupak i korišten drugi materijal. Naime, podove kuća tvore dosta debeli slojevi sitnog kamenja čvrsto nabijenog u podlogu bez ikakve njezine prethodne pripreme. Male i vrlo rijetke glinaste površine među kamenjem ne odaju dojam namjere nego više djeluju kao posve slučajne posljedice u pripremanju podnica (sl. 23–25; plan 4).

Za razliku od starije stambene razine danilskog naselja u kojoj nisu ustanovljene nikakve pojedinosti enteri-

consist of rather thick layers of pebbles rammed into the base without any previous preparation. Small and very rare clay patches between stones do not appear to be intentional, they look more like accidental consequences in the process of floor making (Fig. 23–25; Plan 4).

As opposed to the earlier occupation level of the Danilo settlement in which no interior details were found, there were several hearths at this level. Carefully made hearth of almost regular circular form is particularly interesting, with diameter of over 50 cm, whose edge was made of vertically arranged stone plates (Fig. 26a–b). Other examples usually include much simpler procedures seeming more like simple fireplaces than more permanent hearths. Substruction is very simple, if there is any, and none of them has separate edge. Only thick layer of ash and burnt earth indicate to their repeated use (Fig. 27a–b; 28). It remains unclear what was the meaning and function of several round formations made of small stones but without any traces of burning (Fig. 29a–b).

The question of existence of one or several massive stone constructions similar to the ones from the Early Neolithic settlement remains open as already mentioned. Excavations from 2010/2011 and 2013 give no answer to this question so that any more extensive discussion about this issue would be purely speculative. However in this context we should not forget a piece of information about the character of deposit in probe IV from the excavations by Z. Brusić who mentioned that possibility very suggestively (Brusić 2008: 53).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Stone structures in the Early Neolithic settlement in Pokrovnik doubtlessly represent a unique phenomenon not only in the Neolithic of the eastern Adriatic but also in neighbouring spatial and cultural environments. This statement does not mean that I have overseen data on shallow ditches in Smilčić (Batović 1966: 49–50), several ditches of rather vague character in Danilo (Korošec 1964: 5, 16, 18–19, 72; Batović 1979: 528–529), similar but only partially excavated ditch in Velištak (Podrug 2013: 205–206), enclosed sepulchral area in the Starčevo culture settlement in Galovo (Minichreiter 1999: 12–17; Minichreiter, Botić 2010: 105–124), system with ditches and palisades in Okolište (Hofmann et al. 2009: 36–40), and the most recent information of the kind from northern Croatia (Šiljeg et al. 2015: 358). Namely stone structures in Pokrovnik have dimension of uniqueness not only as a phenomenon without comparable examples in terms of construction at other synchronous sites neither in immediate nor in wider spatial and cultural surroundings: constructions which illustrate a serious construction activity and organized collective act due to material used and building techniques applied. Their uniqueness is expressed primarily through multiplicity and concentric distribution, and only then through evident successiveness in construction and direct dependence of the settlement area on the perimeter of space bordered by the structures which at the same time reflects not only dynamics of spatial planning



Sl. 21 Blok A: Danilska kultura; ostatci podnice iz starije razine (detalj)
 Fig. 21 Block A: Danilo culture; floor remains from the earlier level (detail)

jera, na ovoj je razini stanovanja ustanovljeno postojanje više ognjišta. Posebno se ističe pomno formirano ognjište gotovo pravilna kružnog oblika, promjera preko 50 cm, s rubom od okomito učvršćenoga pločastog kamena (sl. 26a–b). U ostalim primjerima riječ je o znatno skromnijim zahvatima koji više djeluju kao jednostavna vatrišta nego trajnija ognjišta. Supstrukcija je vrlo jednostavna ili uopće ne postoji, a nijedno od njih nema posebno formiran rub. Samo deblji sloj pepela i izgorjela zemlja upućuje na njihovu višekratnu uporabu (sl. 27a–b; 28). Posve je nejasan smisao i funkcija više kružnih formacija sitnog kamena uz koje nisu ustanovljene nikakve posljedice gorenja (sl. 29a–b).

Pitanje postojanja jedne ili više masivnih kamenih konstrukcija sličnih onima iz naselja ranog neolitika ostaje, kako je već naglašeno, posve otvoreno. Iskopavanja provedena 2010./2011. i 2013. na to pitanje ne daju nikakav odgovor, pa bi bilo kakva opsežnija rasprava o tome ostala u području spekulacija. Ipak, u tom kontekstu ne treba zaboraviti podatak o karakteru depozita u sondi IV s iskopavanja Z. Brusića koji tu mogućnost vrlo sugestivno navodi (Brusić 2008: 53).



Sl. 22 Blok A: Danilska kultura; ostatci podnice iz starije razine (detalj)
 Fig. 22 Block A: Danilo culture; floor remains from the earlier level (detail)



Sl. 23 Blok A: Danilska kultura; ostatci podnice iz mlađe razine
Fig. 23 Block A: Danilo culture; floor remains from the later level



Sl. 24 Blok A: Danilska kultura; ostatci podnice iz mlađe razine
Fig. 24 Block A: Danilo culture; floor remains from the later level



Sl. 25 Blok A: Danilska kultura; ostatci podnice iz mlađe razine
 Fig. 25 Block A: Danilo culture; floor remains from the later level

RASPRAVA I ZAKLJUČAK


Kamene strukture u ranoneolitičkom naselju na Pokrovniku nedvojbeno predstavljaju posve jedinstvenu pojavu (fenomen) ne samo u neolitiku istočnog Jadrana nego i u susjednim prostornim i kulturnim ambijentima. Dakako, pri ovoj konstataciji nisam izgubio iz vida podatke o plitkim rovovima u Smilčiću (Batović 1966: 49–50), nekoliko rovova dosta neodređenog karaktera u Danilu (Korošec 1964: 5, 16, 18–19, 72; Batović 1979: 528–529), sličnom ali samo djelomice istraženom rovu u Velištaku (Podrug 2013: 205–206), ograđenom sepulkralnom prostoru na starčevačkom naselju u Galovu (Minichreiter 1999: 12–17; Minichreiter, Botić 2010: 105–124), sustav s rovovima i palisadama na Okolištu (Hofmann et al. 2009: 36–40), kao ni najnovije podatke te vrste iz sjeverne Hrvatske (Šiljeg et al. 2015: 358). Naime, dimenziju jedinstvenosti kamene strukture u Pokrovniku nemaju samo kao pojava za koju ne postoje konstruktivno blisko usporedivi primjeri na drugim istodobnim nalazištima ni u neposrednom ni u širem prostornom i kulturnom okruženju: konstrukcije koje svojom masivnošću, upotrijebljenim materijalom i primijenjenom tehnikom građenja

but also permanence of a pattern in development and organization of a settlement whole.

Neolithic settlements encircled (enclosed, closed) with more or less complex system of ditches, palisades or combination of both, and sometimes also stone walls, are not a unique phenomenon related to certain geographical or cultural environment, but they are widespread from south-east to western boundaries of the European region, appearing in all chronological segments of the Neolithic (Aslanis 2008: 35–45; Todorova, Vajsov 1986: 72–86; Neustupný 2006: 1–4; Chapman, Gaydarska 2006: 24–43; Barna, Pásztor 2010: 119–125; Gojda 2006: 5–19; Lazarovici, Lazarovici 2011: 19–38; Lazarovici 2014: 11–67; Podborský, Kovárník 2006: 44–68; Merce 2006: 69–75; Kunst 2006: 76–97; Barna et al. 2015: 75–88; Chmielewski et al. 2015: 267–271; Raczky, Anders 2012: 271–309; Sarris et al. 2013: 1454–1470; Parkinson, Duffy 2007: 97–141; Löckern et al. 2009; etc.). What is more their number constantly grows proportionally to intensification of use of aerial photography and geophysical prospections in determining archaeological potentials of different regions, so that recent literature offers an increasing number of studies dealing with purpose, function and character of such



Plan 3 Blok A: Danilska kultura; starija razina
Plan 3 Block A: Danilo culture; earlier level



Plan 4 Blok A: Danilska kultura; mlađa razina
Plan 4 Block A: Danilo culture; later level



Sl. 26a Blok A: Ognjište danilske kulture
Fig. 26a Block A: Danilo culture, hearth



Sl. 26b Blok A: Ognjište danilske kulture
Fig. 26b Block A: Danilo culture, hearth



Sl. 27a Blok A: Ognjište danilske kulture
Fig. 27a Block A: Danilo culture, hearth



Sl. 27b Blok A: Ognjište danilske kulture
Fig. 27b Block A: Danilo culture, hearth

ilustriraju ozbiljan graditeljski zahvat i organiziran kolektivni čin. Njihova se jedinstvenost iskazuje prije svega kroz višestrukost i koncentričan raspored, potom kroz očiglednu sukcesivnost u podizanju te izravnu ovisnost naseobinskog prostora o opsegu površine koju one omeđuju, a kroz koju se istodobno manifestira ne samo dinamika prostornog planiranja nego i ustaljenost jednog obrasca u razvoju i organizaciji naseobinske cjeline.

Neolitička nalazišta okružena (ograđena, zatvorena) jednostavnijim ili složenijim sustavom jaraka (rovova), palisadama ili kombinacijom jednih i drugih, a ponekad i ka-

systems, and meaning and position of such enclosed sites in their spatial and cultural environment. In this context several terms are used in their description: *ditches, enclosures, encircles, surroundings, rondels, fortifications* (for an overview cf: Parkinson, Duffy 2007: 102; Podborský, Kovárník 2006: 62) which reveal attitudes of certain authors towards purpose of enclosures and thereby character of the site they appear at. Although some of the mentioned terms are more or less corresponding in their basic content-related meaning, there are certain differences in their semantical scope enabling contextual or conceptual variations or important con-

menim zidovima, nisu nikakav fenomen ekskluzivno vezan uz određeni zemljopisni ili kulturni ambijent, nego su široko rasprostranjena pojava od krajnjeg jugoistoka do zapadnih granica europskog prostora, a javljaju se u svim vremenskim odsjecima neolitika (Aslanis 2008: 35–45; Todorova, Vajsov 1986: 72–86; Neustupný 2006: 1–4; Chapman, Gaydarska 2006: 24–43; Barna, Pásztor 2010: 119–125; Gojda 2006: 5–19; Lazarovici, Lazarovici 2011: 19–38; Lazarovici 2014: 11–67; Podborský, Kovárník 2006: 44–68; Merce 2006: 69–75; Kunst 2006: 76–97; Barna et al. 2015: 75–88; Chmielewski et al. 2015: 267–271; Raczky, Anders 2012: 271–309; Sarris et al. 2013: 1454–1470; Parkinson, Duffy 2007: 97–141; Löckern et al. 2009; etc.). Štoviše, njihov se broj stalno povećava proporcionalno intenziviranju uporabe zračne fotografije i geofizičkih prospekcija pri utvrđivanju arheoloških potencijala različitih područja, pa je posve prirodno što je u recentnijoj literaturi sve veći broj priloga koji se bave namjenom, funkcijom i karakterom takvih sustava te značenjem i položajem tako okruženih nalazišta u svom prostornom i kulturnom ambijentu. U tom se kontekstu već pri njihovoj deskripciji koristi više termina – rovovi, ograde, krugovi, okruženja, kružni objekti i utvrđenja (*ditches, enclosures, encircles, surroundings, rondels, fortifications* – za pregled termina usporediti: Parkinson, Duffy 2007: 102; Podborský, Kovárník 2006: 62) – koji već sami po sebi u dobroj mjeri implicitno određuju stavove pojedinih autora prema svrsi



Sl. 28 Blok A: Ognjište danilske kulture
Fig. 28 Block A: Danilo culture, hearth



Sl. 29a Blok A: Danilska kultura; ognjište i kamene kružne konstrukcije (u pozadini)
Fig. 29a Block A: Danilo culture: hearth and circular stone constructions (in the background)

ograda i ograđivanja, a time i prema karakteru nalazišta na kojima se javljaju. Premda se neki od navedenih termina u osnovnom sadržajnom smislu više ili manje podudaraju, u njihovu značenjskom opsegu postoje i određene razlike koje omogućuju kontekstualno ili konceptualno uvjetovana variranja ili bitna razilaženja u interpretacijama funkcionalnosti ograda i karaktera nalazišta s nekim od spomenutih oblika ograđivanja. Dobar dio autora koji su se bavili problematikom ograđenih nalazišta naseobinskog karaktera već uporabom izraza utvrda, utvrđena naselja ili sustav utvrda (*fortifications, fortified settlements, fortification system*), skloni su u svim takvim primjerima vidjeti izrazito obrambenu ulogu, a njihovu zaštitnu funkciju interpretirati u kontekstu različitim razlozima uvjetovanih konflikta među neolitičkim zajednicama (Todorova, Vajsov 1986: 72–86; Horváth 1988: 145–149; Kokkinidou, Nikolaidou 1999: 89–99; Aslanis 2008: 35–45; Runnels et al. 2009: 165–194; Lazarovici, Lazarovici 2011: 19–38; Lazarovici 2014: 11–67; etc.). Nasuprot njima, interpretativni okviri u kojima se kreću drugi autor znatno su raznovrsniji i širi, pa u postojanju istih ili sličnih pojava vide čitav niz drugih razloga praktične, sociološke, ekonomske, religijske, simboličke naravi (uključujući tu aspekte grupnog identiteta, teritorijalnosti, društvene memorije) i sl., te ih interpretiraju kao naseobinska središta, mjesta okupljanja, sociokultne prostore, sakralne prostore, kružna svetišta, svete krugove, solarne hramove, drvene i zemljane rotunde (*central places, places of assembly, sociocultic areas, sacral precincts, sanctuaries, round sanctuaries, sacred circles, solar temples, wood and earth rotundas*) i tako dalje (Sherratt 1990: 147–167; Whittle 1996: 366; 1997; Bradley 1998; Edmonds 1999; Bailey 2000; Neustupný 2006: 1–4; Barna, Pásztor 2010: 119–125; Raczky, Andres 2012: 271–309; Barna et al. 2015: 75–88; etc.). Zbog toga iza termina s bliskim ili podudarnim osnovnim značenjem često stoje posve različite interpretacije.

Tako npr. nalazišta okružena rovovima A. Whittle interpretira kao mjesta namijenjena okupljanjima radi slavlja, pogrebnih rituala i proslava, a samu aktivnost oko njihova okruživanja povezuje s izgradnjom zajedničkog identiteta i razvijanja osjećaja podrijetla i pripadnosti (Whittle 1996: 366). Više autora u monumentalnim primjerima ove vrste vidi izraz grupnog identiteta, teritorijalnosti i društvenog pamćenja (Bailey 2000; Bradley 1998; Edmonds 1999; Sherratt 1990). U istim pojavama na području istočne Mađarske P. Raczky i A. Anders vide posljedice više razine društvene organizacije od one u prethodnim razdobljima, a smatraju ih manifestacijama posebnih stavova u vremenu i prostoru koji čine dio neolitičkog paketa (Raczky, Andres 2012: 304). Postojanje sličnih sustava M. Kaczanowska i ostali smatraju izrazom visoke razine integriranog korištenja prostora unutar naselja koja uključuje njegovu podjelu na zone specijalizirane za različite aktivnosti (Kaczanowska et al. 1997: 271), itd.

Navedene konceptualne i interpretativne razlike koje ovdje nisu predmet posebne analize i rasprave nego su navedene samo kao ilustracija vrlo različitih polazišta, treba promatrati kao posve prirodan nastavak već stoljeće dugih rasprava potaknutih najpoznatijim primjerima te vrste na



Sl. 29b Blok A: Daniilska kultura; kamena kružna konstrukcija (detalj)

Fig. 29b Block A: Danilo culture: circular stone constructions (detail)

forms. A fair number of authors who dealt with problems of enclosed settlements with dwelling character are inclined to see defensive function in such examples reflected in the use of terms *fortifications, fortified settlements, fortification system*. Their defensive function is interpreted in context of variously motivated conflicts between the Neolithic communities. (Todorova, Vajsov 1986: 72–86; Horváth 1988: 145–149; Kokkinidou, Nikolaidou 1999: 89–99; Aslanis 2008: 35–45; Runnels et al. 2009: 165–194; Lazarovici, Lazarovici 2011: 19–38; Lazarovici 2014: 11–67; etc.). As opposed to them, interpretative frameworks provided by other authors are far more diverse and far-reaching so that in identical or similar phenomena they see a series of reasons of practical, sociological, economic, religious and symbolical nature (including the aspects of group identity, territoriality, social memory) etc. and interpret them as *central places, places of assembly, sociocultic areas, sacral precincts, sanctuaries, round sanctuaries, sacred circles, solar temples, wood and earth rotundas*, etc. (Sherratt 1990: 147–167; Whittle 1996: 366; 1997; Bradley 1998; Edmonds 1999; Bailey 2000; Neustupný 2006: 1–4; Barna, Pásztor 2010: 119–125; Raczky, Andres 2012: 271–309; Barna et al. 2015: 75–88; etc.). Therefore terms with similar or identical basic meaning can often have different interpretations.

For instance, A. Whittle interprets sites enclosed with ditches as places intended for assemblies in relation to festivities, funerary rituals and celebrations, and he associates the activities concerning their enclosing with building common identity and developing a sense of belonging and common ancestry (Whittle 1996: 366). Several authors see an expression of group identity, territoriality and social memory in monumental examples of the kind (Bailey 2000; Bradley 1998; Edmonds 1999; Sherratt 1990). P. Raczky and A. Anders interpret same phenomena in the region of eastern Hungary as consequences of a higher level of social organization than the one in previous periods, and they see them as manifestations of special attitudes in time and space making a part of the Neolithic package (Raczky, Andres

području Tesalije – Seskla i Diminija – oko čijeg karaktera ni danas nema jedinstvenog mišljenja. S druge strane, veća usuglašenost ideja i interpretacija uz znatno veći broj sličnih pojava bila bi neprirodna upravo onoliko koliko je neprirodna i sama pomisao da su sve ograde na neolitičkim nalazištima imale sličnu ulogu ili funkciju unutar društava koja su ih stvorila i koristila (Darvill, Thomas 2001: 13).

Posve je jasno da je osnovna funkcija svake ograde odvojiti prostor unutar od onoga izvan nje. Međutim, isto je tako jasno da razloge odvajanja unutarnjeg od vanjskog prostora ne određuje postojanje ograde samo po sebi, kao što ni karakter ograđenog prostora ne određuje samo njegovo postojanje nego priroda i sadržaj aktivnosti koje se u takvom prostoru odvijaju (Parkinson, Duffy 2007: 124; Harding et al. 2006: IX).

Ograđivanje nalazišta zasigurno je vrlo kompleksan fenomen povezan s vrlo širokim spektrom pitanja koja se tiču same prirode neolitičkog društva, gospodarskih i ambijentalnih faktora, položaja zajednica u širem socijalnom prostoru, njihovih interakcija i sl., ali i pitanja koja se tiču interakcije među članovima pojedinih zajednica, osjećaja identiteta i pripadnosti, suglasnosti oko zajedničkih normi, ciljeva i vrijednosti i sl. Zbog toga se pokušaji stvaranja nekih univerzalnih klasifikacija ili interpretativnih paradigmi primjenjivih na svim mjestima, u dugim vremenskim rasponima i s velikim prostornim obuhvatom čine besmislenim, ne samo zbog toga što u dobroj mjeri pretpostavljaju istovrsnost ili podudarnost u praksama i obrascima ponašanja neolitičkih zajednica, nego više zbog toga što minimiziraju ulogu bitnih determinanti njihovih identiteta i subjektiviteta izraženih kroz varijabilnosti u reakcijama na pojavnosti i okolnosti u zadanim prostornim i ambijentalnim realitetima. Drugim riječima, bez obzira na njihovu sveopću povezanost s nizom vrijednosti koje čine sadržaj ovog razdoblja prapovijesti, neolitičke zajednice istodobno su i partikularne društvene grupe s vlastitim iskustvima, tradicijama, vrijednostima i normama formiranim kroz individualne interakcije u unutarnjem i skupne interakcije u vanjskom socijalnom prostoru. To samo po sebi znači da u pojedinačnim društvenim sklopovima osim općih mogu postojati i oni posebni elementi koji uvjetuju divergentnost ili varijabilnost u njihovu ponašanje.

Zbog tih i drugih sličnih razloga, po mom mišljenju, svakom nalazištu s pojavama te vrste treba pristupati kao pojedinačnom i specifičnom primjeru pokušavajući razumjeti potrebe i razloge koji su mogli utjecati na njihovo postojanje u konkretnom slučaju, ali koji ne moraju biti podudarni, čak ni bliski s drugim takvim primjerima. To je razlog zbog kojeg postojanje ograda u ranoneolitičkom, a možda i srednjoneolitičkom, naselju u Pokrovniku ovdje nemam namjeru uklapati u neki od postojećih interpretativnih okvira, nego njihovu pojavu razumjeti kao reakciju na okolnosti u zadanim prostornim i ambijentalnim okvirima.

Naime, neolitičko naselje u Pokrovniku smješteno je na rubnom dijelu polja, a svojom južnom i jugoistočnom periferijom praktički je „naslonjeno“ na Gradinu, četrdesetak metara viši brijeg s ostatcima kasnijeg brončanodobnog/željeznodobnog naselja. Sa svih ostalih strana naselje je

2012: 304). M. Kaczanowska and others believe that existence of similar systems should be interpreted as an expression of high level of integrated use of space within a settlement which includes its division to zones specialized for different activities (Kaczanowska et al. 1997: 271), etc.

Mentioned conceptual and interpretative differences which are not an object of special analysis and discussion here, but are only mentioned as an illustration of very different starting points, should be observed as natural continuation of century-long discussions incited by the most famous examples of the kind in the region of Thessaly – Sesklo and Dimini, whose character is still an open question. On the other hand, more pronounced agreement of ideas and interpretations with a growing number of similar phenomena would be unnatural just as it is unnatural to think that all enclosures at the Neolithic sites had similar role or function in the society which made and used them (Darvill, Thomas 2001: 13).

It is clear that basic function of each fence is to separate the interior area from the outside. However it is just as clear that reasons for such separation are not defined by the existence of the fence in itself, just as the character of the enclosure is not determined by its mere existence but also by nature and activities happening in such an area (Parkinson, Duffy 2007: 124; Harding et al. 2006: IX).

Site enclosure is definitely a very complex phenomenon associated with a wide range of questions relating to the very nature of the Neolithic society, economic and environmental factors, position of communities in the wider social area, their interactions etc., and also with questions concerning interaction between the members of certain communities, sense of belonging and identity, agreement about common norms, aims, values etc. Therefore it seems senseless to try to create some universal classifications or interpretive paradigms applicable in all places, in long chronological ranges and with wide spatial scope, not only because most of them imply identicalness or correspondence in practices and behaviour patterns of the Neolithic communities, but even more because they minimize the role of important determinants of their identities and subjectivities expressed through variability in reactions on manifestations and circumstances in given spatial and environmental conditions. In other words, regardless of their general association with a series of values that are at the core of this prehistoric period, the Neolithic communities are at the same time particular social groups with their own experiences, traditions, values and norms formed through individual interactions in the inner social space and collective interactions in the outer social space. This means that those special elements that cause divergence or variability in behaviour in individual social circles can exist alongside general elements.

In that regard and due to other similar reasons, I believe that each site exhibiting phenomena of the mentioned kind should be approached as a particular and specific example in an attempt of understanding needs and reasons which may have affected their existence in a specific case, but which need not be corresponding, or even close to other

potpuno otvoreno prema Velikom podu, prostranom polju koje je svojim blagim reljefom bez oštrih lomova terena, vizualnih ograničenja i komunikacijskih zapreka predstavljalo idealan prostorni i ambijentalni okvir za stočarsku granu neolitičke privrede, a na rubnim dijelovima i za njezinu ratarsku komponentu. Gradina na južnom rubu naselja svojom je vrpnačkom građom mogla zadovoljiti sve potrebe za građevnim materijalom i većinu drugih potreba za tom vrstom sirovine, a niski brežuljci dalje prema istoku zasigurno su, jednako kao i danas, mogli biti prikladna lovišta sitne i druge divljači. Sve su to pogodnosti koje su imale važnu ulogu pri izboru mjesta za osnivanje neolitičkog naselja. Međutim, nijednu od njih ovdje ne držim odlučujućim razlogom za tu odluku. Krucijalnu ulogu u tom smislu morao je imati izvor tekuće vode u podnožju brijega na koji je neolitičko naselje „naslonjeno”. To je nedvojbeno osnovni razlog osnivanja i kasnijeg naselja brončanog/željeznog doba, a i postojanja recentnog naselja s nešto dužom poviješću. U ambijentu s izrazito niskim hidrološkim potencijalom kakav je čitav taj prostor, postojanje stalnog izvora značilo je temeljni preduvjet stabilnosti zajednice i trajnosti naselja, a raspolaganje njegovim kapacitetima nije predstavljalo samo pogodnost nego nemjerljivu prednost pred drugim istodobnim zajednicama iz užeg okruženja (u bližoj okolici Pokrovnika poznata su dva nalazišta ranog neolitika, oba na približnoj udaljenosti oko 5–6 km: Škarin samograd; Batović 1966: 86–88; Müller 1988: 219–235; i Konjevrate; Mendušić 1998: 54–55). Ta je okolnost kod prvih stanovnika Pokrovnika zasigurno morala stvoriti osjećaj superiornosti ali i vrlo lako izgraditi svijest o posjedovanju te razviti pretenziju za ekskluzivnim kontroliranjem tako dragocjenog resursa. Zbog toga rano-neolitički stanovnici Pokrovnika svoje naselje nisu osnovali ni u blizini vrela, a ni pokraj njega, nego su zauzeli čitav prostor na kojem se nalazi, inkorporirali ga u svoju naseobinsku površinu, pa je ono tako postalo njezin integralni dio. Time je vrelo postalo ne samo kolektivno dobro nego i kolektivni posjed. Da je riječ upravo o takvom tipu odnosa prema sasvim određenoj vrsti prirodnog potencijala vrlo dobro pokazuje već prva masivna kamena konstrukcija koja je naseobinski prostor i njemu pripadajuće vrelo jasno markirala i fizički odvojila od ostatka polja. To je jasna granica teritorija koji potpuno i isključivo kontrolira samo jedna zajednica, ona koja je svoje prvo naselje locirala na toj poziciji.

Daljnje razvojne dinamike naselja ranoga neolitika s povećavanjem naseobinske površine nisu donijele nikakvu bitnu promjenu u njegovom prostornom odnosu prema vrelu, a to znači ni u svijesti zajednice o njegovom kolektivnom posjedovanju. Nove kamene konstrukcije, podizane u istoj dinamici s dinamikom proširivanja naseobinske površine, slijede isti prostorni obrazac, a to samo po sebi potvrđuje da je odnos uspostavljen pri osnivanju naselja dobio dimenziju konstante. Međutim, čini mi se da bi njihovo postojanje u tom daljnjem razvoju bilo pogrešno promatrati samo na razini jednostavne ilustracije istovrsnog tipa odnosa zajednice prema svom „posjedu”. Naime, upravo to višestruko ponavljanje istog obrasca, po mome mišljenju, očigledan je pokazatelj posve učvršćenog obrasca ponašanja zajednice u prostornom i kulturnom miljeu i širem soci-

such examples. That is why I do not intend to incorporate the presence of enclosures in the Early Neolithic settlement in Pokrovnik (and perhaps also the Middle Neolithic one) into some of existing interpretative frameworks, but I will try to understand their emergence as a reaction to circumstances in a given spatial and environmental framework.

Namely the Neolithic settlement in Pokrovnik is situated on the peripheral part of the field, and with its southern and south-eastern periphery it practically “leans” on Gradina, a hill about 40 m higher than the Neolithic site where the remains of later Bronze Age/Iron Age settlement were found. On all other sides the settlement is open to Veliki pod, a spacious field with mild relief and without sharp cuts of the terrain, visual limitations and communication barriers which was an ideal spatial and environmental setting for herding, and in its peripheral parts also for raising crops. Gradina on the southern edge of the settlement abounds in limestone so it could provide enough building material, and low hills further eastwards could be appropriate hunting ground for small and other game, as they are today. These advantages played an important role in the process of choosing a suitable place for founding a Neolithic settlement. However I do not believe that any of these advantages was crucial for that decision. Decisive role in that regard had to be related to the water source at the foot of the hill on which the Neolithic settlement “leans”. This was undoubtedly the main reason of foundation of the later Bronze/Iron Age settlement, and of existence of a recent settlement with somewhat longer history. In an environment with exceptionally low hydrological potentials as this entire region actually is, existence of permanent water source was basic precondition for stability of community and duration of the settlement. Using its capacities was not only a convenience but also a vast advantage in relation to other synchronous communities from the surroundings (in close vicinity of Pokrovnik are two other Early Neolithic sites, both at approximate distance of 5–6 km: Škarin samograd; Batović 1966: 86–88; Müller 1988: 219–235; i Konjevrate; Mendušić 1998: 54–55). This circumstance had to create a feeling of superiority of the first inhabitants of Pokrovnik, but also consciousness of possession, and it might have developed pretension to exclusive control of such a precious resource. That was the reason why the Early Neolithic inhabitants of Pokrovnik did not found their settlement in the vicinity of the water source, or next to it, but they occupied the entire area making it an integral part of the settlement. In that way the source became not only collective good but also a collective property. This type of disposition toward a very specific kind of natural potential is confirmed by the first massive stone construction which marked the settlement area and the belonging source separating it physically from the rest of the field. This is a clear boundary of the territory controlled exclusively and fully by only one community, the one that chose this position for founding its first settlement.

Further developmental dynamics of the Early Neolithic settlement with increase of the settlement area did not bring any important changes in its spatial relation to the source, and consequently in the consciousness of the

jalnom prostoru.

Premda sam mogućnost postojanja sličnih konstrukcija u naselju srednjeg neolitika ostavio posve otvorenom, zbog čega ovdje nije moguće povlačiti paralele prema naselju ranog neolitika, ipak je indikativno da i daniško naselje ima isti prostorni odnos prema vrelu, a to sugerira i mogućnost istovrsnog odnosa posjedovanja, neovisno o postojanju ograde oko naselja.

I na kraju, ovdje bi se mogla postaviti i pitanja: u kojoj mjeri masivne kamene konstrukcije na Pokrovniku imaju zaštitnu funkciju, odnosno u kojoj su mjeri u funkciji obilježavanja teritorijalnosti naselja?

Nema nikakve dvojbe da bi se u njihovu interpretiranju mogle vidjeti obje navedene funkcije. Međutim, nijednu od njih ne vidim kao primarnu. Naime, pretenzija za posjedovanjem i ekskluzivnim kontroliranjem bilo kakvih resursa sama po sebi nameće i potrebu njihove zaštite od potencijalnih sličnih pretenzija drugih zajednica i time uvjetovanih učestalih ili latentnih konflikata. Ako ekskluzivnost korištenja nije osigurana već populacijskim kapacitetom, odnosno brojnošću zajednice, onda izgradnja fizičkih zapreka i barijera u tom smislu svakako predstavlja najbolje rješenje. Masivnost i širina kamenih konstrukcija, uporaba krupnijeg kamena za formiranje njihova unutarnjeg i vanjskog lica, te neke praznine u zidnoj masi koje ostavljaju i mogućnost korištenje drugih sredstava – drvenih stupova – pri njihovoj izgradnji, sugeriraju upravo takvo rješenje. Međutim, postojanje viših zidova koji bi bili primjereni takvoj funkciji ne držim realnim, kao što nije realna ni vjerojatnost ozbiljnijih pretenzija za preuzimanje prostora. Postojanje takvih zidova nije realno već zbog konstruktivnih razloga, a nijedna od poznatih susjednih zajednica – Škarin Samograd i Konjevrate – u tom smislu nije mogla predstavljati ozbiljniju opasnost. Zbog toga moguću zaštitnu funkciju kamenih konstrukcija na Pokrovniku ne vidim kao reakciju uvjetovanu potrebom sprečavanja postojećih ili predvidivih okolnosti, nego kao aktivnost poduzetu zbog otklanjanja njihove mogućnosti.

Isto tako, nema nikakve dvojbe da kamene konstrukcije na Pokrovniku određuju njegovu naseobinsku površinu, a da ritam njihove sukcesivne gradnje prati ritam kojim se ona povećava, pa samim time imaju i dimenziju njegove najizraavnije teritorijalne determinante. Međutim, ta dimenzija nema svoju ulogu u širem prostornom i ambijentalnom smislu, jer njezina funkcija nije odrediti teritorij naselja u odnosu na prostor i njegovo šire okruženje nego primarno, a rekao bih i očigledno, samo u odnosu na određenu mikropoziciju.

Prijevod / Translations
Marija Kostić

Lektura / Proofreading
Marko Maras

community about their collective possession. New stone constructions, built following the dynamics of spreading the settlement area, respect the same spatial pattern which in itself confirms that the relation established when the settlement was founded became a constant feature. However in my opinion it would be wrong to observe their presence in the further development only on the level of a simple illustration of the identical type of relation of the community to their „property“. I believe that this multiple repetition of the same pattern indicates an ingrained behaviour pattern in spatial and cultural milieu and wider social area.

Although I left open the possibility of existence of similar constructions in the Middle Neolithic settlement, which is why we cannot draw parallels with the Early Neolithic settlement, it is still indicative that the Danilo settlement had identical spatial relation with the water source suggesting a possibility of identical relation of possession, regardless of the fact if the settlement was enclosed.

Finally we could ask questions to what extent massive stone constructions in Pokrovnik have defensive function, that is to what extent they mark the territoriality of the settlement?

There is no doubt that both mentioned functions could be seen in their interpretation. However none of them seems to be of primary importance. Namely pretension to own and exclusively control any resource implies need to protect them from possible similar pretensions of other communities and consequent frequent or latent conflicts. If exclusive right of use was not secured by population capacity i.e. populous community, then construction of physical obstructions and barriers definitely represents the best solution in that regard. This solution is suggested by massiveness and width of stone constructions, use of big stones to form their inner and outer face, and some voids in wall mass which leave a possibility of use of other materials (wooden posts) in their construction. However I do not believe that there were higher walls appropriate to such function just like possibility of serious pretensions to take over an area does not seem likely. Existence of such walls is not convincing due to constructive reasons, and none of the known neighbouring communities (Škarin Samograd and Konjevrate) could pose a serious threat in that regard. Therefore possible protective function of stone constructions in Pokrovnik does not seem like a reaction caused by the need to prevent possible and predictable circumstances, but more like an activity undertaken to eliminate such possibility.

There is no doubt that stone constructions in Pokrovnik determine its settlement area, and that rhythm of their successive building followed the rhythm of its growth having consequently the dimension of its most direct territorial determinant. However this dimension is not relevant in wider spatial and environmental sense as its function was not to determine the territory of the settlement in relation to space and its wider surroundings but primarily and, in my opinion, evidently, only in relation to certain microposition.

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aslanis, I. 2008, Frühe Fortifikationssysteme in Griechenland, in: *Proceedings of the International Symposium: The Aegean in the Neolithic, Chalcolithic and the Early Bronze Age, October 13th–19th 1997, Urla–İzmir (Turkey)*, Erkanal H., Hauptmann H., Şahoglu V., Tuncel R. (eds.), Ankara, 35–45.
- Bailey, D. W. 2000, *Balkan Prehistory: Exclusion, Incorporation and Identity*, Routledge, New York.
- Barna, P. J., Pásztor, E. 2010 Two Neolithic Enclosures at Sormás-Törökföldek (SW-Transdanubia, Hungary) and their possible geometrical and astronomical role. Case study, in: *Monumental Questions: Prehistoric Megaliths, Mounds, and Enclosures*, Calado D., Baldia M., Boulanger M. (eds.), BAR International Series 2122, Oxford, 119–125.
- Barna, J. P., Tokai, Z. M., Eke, I., Pásztor, E. 2015, A késő neolitikus körárok kutatásának helyzete Zala megyében (Current research on late neolithic rondels in Zala county), *Archeometriai Műhely*, Vol. XII/2, 75–88.
- Batović, Š. 1966, *Stariji neolit u Dalmaciji*, Zadar.
- Bradley, R. 1998, *The Significance of Monuments: On the Shaping of Human Experience in Neolithic and Bronze Age Europe*, Routledge, New York.
- Chapman, J., Gaydarska, B. 2006, Does enclosure make a difference? A view from the Balkans, in: *Enclosing the Past: inside and outside in prehistory*, Harding A., Sievers S., Venclová N. (eds.), Sheffield Archaeological Monographs 15, Sheffield, 24–43.
- Chmielewski, T., Furmanek, M., Mackiewicz, M., Myślecki, B., Zakościelna, A. 2015, Landscape with enclosures. Magnetic prospection and surface survey of the Dobużek Scarp microregion, Eastern Poland, *Archaeologia Polona*, Vol. 53, 267–271.
- Darvill, T., Thomas, J. 2001, Neolithic enclosures in Atlantic northwest Europe: Some recent trends, in: *Neolithic Enclosures in Atlantic Northwest Europe*, Darvill T., Thomas J. (eds.), Neolithic Studies Group Seminar Papers 6, Oxbow Books, Oxford, 1–23.
- Edmonds, M. 1999, *Ancestral Geographies of the Neolithic: Landscapes, Monuments and Memory*, Routledge, London.
- Gojda, M. 2006, Large prehistoric enclosures in Bohemia: the evidence from the air, in: *Enclosing the Past: inside and outside in prehistory*, Harding A., Sievers S., Venclová N. (eds.), Sheffield Archaeological Monographs 15, Sheffield, 5–19.
- Harding, A., Sievers, S., Venclová, N. 2006, Introduction, in: *Enclosing the Past: inside and outside in prehistory*, Harding A., Sievers S., Venclová N. (eds.), Sheffield Archaeological Monographs 15, Sheffield, X.
- Hofmann, R., Kujundžić-Vejzagić, Z., Müller, J., Rassmann, K., Müller-Scheessel, N. 2009, Rekonstrukcija procesa naseljavanja u kasnom neolitu na prostoru centralne Bosne, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine*, NS 50–51 (2008/09), 11–178.
- Horvat, K., Vujević, D. 2017, Pokrovnik – materijalna kultura neolitičkog naselja, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu*, Vol. 34, str–str.
- Horváth, F. 1988, Late Neolithic ditches, fortifications and tells in the Hungarian Tisza-region, in: *Gomolava – Chronologie und Stratiographie der vorgeschichtlichen und Antiken Kulturen der Donauniederung und Südosteuropas*, Tasić N., Petrović J. (eds.), Institut za izučavanje istorije Vojvodine, Savez arheoloških društava Jugoslavije, Novi Sad, 145–149.
- Kaczanowska, M., Kozłowski, J. K., Nowak, M. 1997, Conclusions, in: *The Early Linear pottery Culture in eastern Slovakia*, Kozłowski J. K. (ed.), Kraków, 267–273.
- Kokkinidou, D., Nikolaidou, M. 1999, Neolithic enclosures in Greek Macedonia: violent and non-violent aspects of territorial demarcation, in: *Ancient Warfare: Archaeological Perspectives*, Carman J., Harding A. (eds.), Sutton, Stroud, 89–99.
- Korošec, J. 1964, *Danilo in danilska kultura*, Ljubljana.
- Kunst, M. 2006, Zambujal and the enclosures of the Iberian Peninsula, in: *Enclosing the Past: inside and outside in prehistory*, Harding A., Sievers S., Venclová N. (eds.), Sheffield Archaeological Monographs 15, Sheffield, 76–97.
- Lazarovici, G. 2014, Cu privire la sistemele de fortificații din Transilvania și Banat din perioada neoliticului și a Epocii cuprului (Gornea, Parța, Iclod, Fundătura). Partea I: fortificațiile neolitice / About some Neolithic and Copper Age Fortifications System in Transylvania and Banat (Gornea, Parța, Iclod, Fundătura). First part: Neolithic Fortifications, *Angustia*, Vol. 17–18, 11–67.
- Lazarovici, G., Lazarovici, M. C. 2011, Architecture of the Early Neolithic in Romania, in: *The First Neolithic Sites in Central/South-East European Transect, Vol. II: Early neolithic (Starčevo-Criș) sites on the territory of Romania*, Luca S. A., Suciu C. (eds.), Oxford, 19–38.
- Legge, A. J., Moore, A. M. T. 2011, Clutching at straw: the Early Neolithic of Croatia and the dispersal of agriculture, in: *The Dynamics of Neolithisation in Europe: Studies in honour of Andrew Sherratt*, Hadjidakis A., Robinson E., Viner S. (eds.), Oxbow Books, Oxford, 177–196.
- Löcker, K., Nau, E., Neubauer, W., Hinterleitner, A. 2009, Magnetic surveys of Early and Middle Neolithic settlements in Austria, *Archaeosciences. Revue d'archéométrie*, Vol. 33 (suppl.), 101–104.
- Maguš, D., Menđušić, M., Moore, A. M. T. 2008, Arheološka istraživanja u Pokrovniku godine 2006. Školjkaši, *Obavijesti Hrvatskog arheološkog društva*, Vol. XL/2, 28–35.
- McClure, S., Podrug, E. 2009, Neolithic pottery at Danilo and Pokrovnik: preliminary results of stylistic and technological analyses, in: *Arheološka istraživanja na srednjem Jadranu. Znanstveni skup, Vis, 13.–16. listopada 2009.*, Ivčević S. (ed.), Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva 26, Zagreb, str–str.
- McClure, S., Podrug, E. 2010, The culture of Danilo Bitinj and Pokrovnik: results of excavations from 2003 to 2006, Abstracts, *75th Anniversary Meeting, Society for American Archaeology*, St. Louis, Missouri, 171.
- McClure, S. B., Podrug, E., Moore, A. M. T., Culleton, B. J., Kennett, D. J. 2014, AMS 14C Chronology and Ceramic Sequences of Early Farmers in the Eastern Adriatic, *Radiocarbon*, Vol. 56/3, 1019–1038.
- Menđušić, M. 1998, Neolitička naselja na šibensko-drnjskom području, in: *Područje Šibenske županije od pretpovijesti do srednjega vijeka. Znanstveni skup, Šibenik, 18.–20. listopada 1995.*, Čečuk B. (ed.), Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva 19, Zagreb, 47–62.
- Menđušić, M., Moore, A. M. T. 2013, The Early Farming in Dalmatia Project: an Example of a Successful International Archaeological Collaboration, *Obavijesti Hrvatskog arheološkog društva*, Vol. XLV, 25–36.
- Mercer, J. R. 2006, The first known enclosures in southern Britain: their nature, function and role, in space and time, in: *Enclosing the Past: inside and outside in prehistory*, Harding A., Sievers S., Venclová N. (eds.), Sheffield Archaeological Monographs 15, Sheffield, 69–75.
- Minichreiter, K. 1999, Ranoneolitički ukopi i pogrebni običaji u naseljima starčevačkog kulturnog kompleksa, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu*, Vol. 15–16 (1998/99), 5–20.
- Minichreiter, K., Botić, K. 2010, Early Neolithic burials of Starčevo culture at Galovo, Slavonski Brod (Northern Croatia), *Documenta Praehistorica*, Vol. XXXVII, 105–124.
- Moore, A. M. T., Menđušić, M., Smith, J., Podrug, E. 2007, Project "Early farming in Dalmatia": Pokrovnik 2006 (Preliminary results), *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, 3. s. Vol. XL, 25–34.
- Moore, A. M. T. et al. 2007a, Investigating the development of farming in the Adriatic: new excavations at the Neolithic sites of Danilo and Pokrovnik in Croatia, *13th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists*, Zadar, Croatia, 230–231.
- Moore, A. M. T., Menđušić, M., Zaninović, J., Legge, A., Reed, K. 2007b, The impact of early farming on the Mediterranean landscape: preliminary results from the investigation of two Neolithic sites in Dalmatia, Abstracts, *Annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology*, Austin, Texas, 297.
- Moore, A. M. T., Legge, A., Reed, K., Colledge, S. 2010, The Early Farming in Dalmatia Project 2003–2009: new insights on the spread of farming to the Adriatic, Abstracts, *75th Anniversary Meeting, Society for American Archaeology*, St. Louis, Missouri, 1.
- Moore, A. M. T., Menđušić, M., Zaninović, J. 2011, The spread of farming to Mediterranean Europe: new insights from the Early Farming in Dalmatia Project, Abstracts, *112th annual meeting, Archaeological Institute of America*, San Antonio, Texas, 21–22.
- Müller, J. 1988, Škarin Samograd. Eine frühneolithische Station mit monochromer Ware und Impresso-Keramik an der Ostadria, *Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt*, Vol. 18, 219–235.
- Neustupný, E. 2006, Enclosures and fortifications in Central Europe, in: *Enclosing the Past: inside and outside in prehistory*, Harding A., Sievers S., Venclová N. (eds.), Sheffield Archaeological Monographs 15, Sheffield, 1–4.
- Parkinson, A. W., Duffy, R. P. 2007, Fortifications and Enclosures in European Prehistory: A Cross-Cultural Perspective, *Journal of Archaeo-*

- logical Research*, Vol. 15/2, 97–141.
- Podborský, V., Kovárník, J. 2006, Neolithic and post-Neolithic enclosures in Moravia in their central European context, in: *Enclosing the Past: inside and outside in prehistory*, Harding A., Sievers S., Venclová N. (eds.), Sheffield Archaeological Monographs 15, Sheffield, 44–68.
- Podrug, E. 2013, Neolitički nepokretni nalazi na šibenskom području, *Diadora*, Vol. 26–27, 185–201.
- Podrug, E., McClure, S. B., Moore, A. M. T., Culleton, B. J., Kennett, D. J. 2014, New AMS 14C dates for the Neolithic of Northern Dalmatia (Croatia), Poster, *Preistoria e Protostoria del Caput Adria, XLIX Riunione Scientifica dell' IIPP*, Udine, 10. 9. 2014.
- Podrug, E. 2016, Villages, Landscapes, and Early Farming in Northern Dalmatia, in: *Fresh Fields and Pastures New: Papers Presented in Honor of Andrew M. T. Moore*, Lillios K. T., Chazan M. (eds.), Sidestone Press, Leiden, 117–145.
- Raczky P., Andres, A. 2012, Neolithic enclosures in Eastern Hungary and their survival into the Copper Age, in: *Neolithische Kreisgrabenanlagen in Europa / Neolithic Circular Enclosures in Europe. Internationale Arbeitstagung 7–9 Mai 2004 in Goseck (Sachsen-Anhalt)*, Bertemes F., Meller H. (eds.), Tagungen des Landesmuseums für Vorgeschichte Halle 8, Landesmuseum für Vorgeschichte, Halle (Saale), 271–309.
- Runnels, C. N., Payne, C., Rifkind, N., White, C., Wolff, N., LeBlanc, S. 2009, Warfare in Neolithic Thessaly: A Case Study, *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Vol. 78/2 (April–June 2009), 165–194.
- Sarris, A., Papadopulos, N., Agapiou, A., Salvi, M. C., Hadjimitsis, D. G., Parkinson, W. A., Yerkes, R. W., Gyucha, A., Duffy, P. R. 2013, Integration of geophysical surveys, ground hyperspectral measurements, aerial and satellite imagery for archaeological prospecting of prehistoric sites: the Case study of Vésztő-Mágor Tell, Hungary, *Journal of Archaeological Science*, Vol. 40/3, 1454–1470.
- Sherratt, A. 1990, The genesis of megaliths: Monumentality, ethnicity and social complexity in Neolithic north-west Europe, *World Archaeology*, Vol. 22/2, 147–167.
- Šiljeg, B., Kalafatić, H., Hršak, T. 2015, Circles in the rye: Neolithic "Twin" Enclosures on the South of Carpathian Basin, Croatia, Poster, 21st Annual Meeting The European Association of Archaeologists (EAA 2015), Glasgow, 358.
- Whittle, A. 1996, *Europe in the Neolithic: The Creation of New Worlds*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Whittle, A. 1997, *Sacred Mound, Holy Rings. Silbury Hill and the West Kennet Palisade Enclosures: A Late Neolithic Complex in North Wiltshire*, Oxbow Books, London.
- Todorova, H., Vajsov, I. 1986, Най-ранните укрепителни системи в България (Naj-rannite ukrepitelni sistemi v Blgarija; The earliest fortification systems in Bulgaria), *Военно исторически сборник (Voenna istoričeski sbornik)*, Vol. 3, 72–86.