

NOSTRO ARCHAEOLOGIAE INDICAE PROFESSORI SIMEONI BATOVIC

Predgovor 12. svesku Archaeologiae Adriaticae / Foreword to the 12th Volume of Archaeologia Adriatica

SINEVA KUKOČ

I. Senjanina 12a
HR-23000 Zadar
kukocsineva@gmail.com

UDK: 929Batović, Š.

902-05Batović, Š.

DOI: 10.15291/archo.3021

Primljeno / Received: 2018-12-12

KLJUČNE RIJEČI:

*Šime Batović, prapovijes-
na arheologija, neolitik,
željezno doba, Smilčić,
Liburni*

Možda još nedovoljno iscrpno valoriziran, prikaz znanstvenog i stručnog opusa arheologa dr. sc. Šime Batovića, red. prof. prezentiran je arheološkoj i široj javnosti u više navrata. Ovaj predgovor tek je vrlo kratki sažetak njegovog znanstvenog karaktera, s ponekim odabranim biografskim i bibliografskim podacima. Trebao bi predložiti bitnosti njegovog slojevitog opusa, ono što ga je odredilo i oblikovalo, učinilo temeljnim i trajnim u hrvatskoj prapovijesnoj arheologiji.

KEY WORDS:

*Šime Batović, prehistoric
archaeology, Neolithic,
Iron age, Smilčić, the
Liburnians*

Overview of scientific and professional work of the archaeologist Šime Batović, PhD, full professor has been presented to the archaeological and wide public on more than one occasion. Even so, it is still not thoroughly evaluated. This foreword is only a very brief summary of his scholarly qualities, with selected biographic or bibliographic information. It should present importance of his complex work, what determined and shaped it, making it fundamental and permanent in Croatian prehistoric archaeology.

Možda još nedovoljno iscrpno valoriziran, prikaz znanstvenog i stručnog opusa arheologa dr. sc. Šime Batovića, red. prof. (Vrsi, 7. srpnja 1927. – Zadar, 13. listopada 2016.) ipak je prezentiran arheološkoj i široj javnosti u više navrata. Ponajprije su to njegovi glavni znanstveni dometi i sređena bibliografija, no samo do 2002. godine (*U osvjet povijesti, Opera selecta I, II*, Zadar).

Ovaj pak predgovor kratki je sažetak njegovog znanstvenog karaktera, s ponekim odabranim biografskim i bibliografskim podacima. Trebao bi predložiti bitnosti njegovog slojevitog opusa, ono što ga je odredilo i oblikovalo, učinilo temeljnim i trajnim u hrvatskoj prapovijesnoj arheologiji. To je ponajprije bio Batovićev kreativni nerv, njegov znanstveni eros, dakako, i vrijeme njegova djelovanja: poseban „arheološki trenutak“ i opći društveni okvir, poslijeratni i kasniji. Iznad svega, to je činjenica da rad u arheologiji njemu nije bio samo struka, već važan životni sadržaj. „Neopisiva je sreća kad na arheološkom lokalitetu dođem do novoga otkrića“, izjavio je zadarskom novinaru 2002. godine u „Razgovoru s povodom.“ Sretan je to trenutak svakog istraživača, no Batović je na terenu i u studijskom kabinetu arheologiju doista živio.

Bio je dugogodišnji muzealac, kustos i ravnatelj zadarskog Arheološkog muzeja, istovremeno predavač na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zadru, povremeno i na drugim znanstvenim i stručnim ustanovama (Zagreb, Ljubljana, Pula, Dubrovnik) i, kao predsjednik Matice hrvatske u Zadru, uporni promicatelj sveukupne zadarske i hrvatske baštine, od prapovijesti do danas. Rad u arheologiji počeo je 1953. Još i tada prapovijest sjeverne Dalmacije bila je slabo istražena, sa skromnim činjeničnim fundusom, a cijeli istočnojadranski svijet bez pravih sinteza za sva razdoblja prapovijesti. U tim ranim danima moderne hrvatske prapovijesne arheologije 50-tih, već se nazirala kulturna stratifikacija jadranskog neolitika (G. Novak: Markova

Overview of scientific and professional work of the archaeologist Šime Batović, PhD, full professor (Vrsi, July 7, 1927 – Zadar, October 10, 2016) has been presented to the archaeological and wide public on more than one occasion. This refers primarily to his main scholarly achievements and organized bibliography, but only until the year 2002 (*U osvjet povijesti, Opera selecta I, II*, Zadar). That said, his work has still not been assessed thoroughly.

This foreword is only a very brief summary of his scholarly qualities, with selected biographic or bibliographic information. It should present importance of his complex work, what determined and shaped it, making it fundamental and permanent in Croatian prehistoric archaeology. This was primarily Batović's creative boldness, his scientific enthusiasm, and definitely time of his activity: special “archaeological moment” and general social framework, post-war and later. Most of all it is the fact that archaeological work was not only his profession but also an important part of his life. “When I discover something new at an archaeological site, I could not be happier”, he said in an interview in 2001. It is a lucky moment for every researcher, but Batović really lived archaeology in excavations and in his study room.

For years he worked in a museum, as a curator and a director of the Archaeological Museum in Zadar, and simultaneously a lecturer at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zadar, and occasionally in other scientific and professional institutions (Zagreb, Ljubljana, Pula, Dubrovnik), and as a president of Matica hrvatska in Zadar, persistent promoter of the heritage of Zadar and Croatia, from prehistory to the present. His work in archaeology started in 1953. Back then prehistory of northern Dalmatia was poorly known, with modest factual knowledge, and entire eastern Adriatic world had no proper synthesis for any of the prehistoric periods. In these early days of modern prehistoric archaeology in Croatia in the 1950s, cultural stratification of the

špilja na Hvaru, 1953.; J. Korošec: Danilo, 1953.-1954.; A. Benac: Crvena stijena, 1953.-1954., Zelena pećina, 1957.). Ali, Batovićevo otkriće Smilčića i smilčićke *impresso* kulture 1956. bilo je karika koja je nedostajala. U tadašnjem procesu prvog terenskog i znanstvenog (teorijskog) uzleta prapovijesne arheologije na istočnom Jadranu i zaleđu, koji se u kontinuitetu uspješno nastavio 60-tih i 70-tih godina XX. stoljeća, i nadalje, uloga Š. Batovića bila je izuzetno važna. Bio je to početak niza njegovih analiza, studija i sinteza o jadranskom neolitiku (*Stariji neolit u Dalmaciji*, Zadar, 1966; i dr.). One su jadransku i hrvatsku arheologiju neolitika definitivno uklopile u europske znanstvene standarde. Otvorile su plodne rasprave s arheolozima u zemljama bivše Jugoslavije (S. Dimitrijević, A. Benac, J. Korošec, T. Bregant, B. Čečuk i drugi) i uspostavile važan dijalog s talijanskim neolitičarima. Znatno su olakšale rad svim mladim istraživačima. Oni su ih s vremenom nadopunjavali i stanovito preoblikovali, no nikad bitno. Njegove interpretacije neolitičkog kulturnog slijeda Smilčić-Danilo-Hvar (Jadranska zona, Neolitsko doba, *Prapovijest jugoslovenskih zemalja II*, Sarajevo, 1979.) osobito autorovo shvaćanje i danas aktualnog problema procesa neolitizacije Jadrana i Sredozemlja nadživjeli su njegovo vrijeme (*Néolithisation en Adriatique*; u: *Premières communautés paysannes en Méditerranée occidentale*, Paris, 1987.).

Prve „ključne riječi“ za opus Š. Batovića očito su: Smilčić, Danilo, Hvar, neolitik, Jadran, neolitizacija. One su postali svojevrsni sinonimi, gotovo simboli jednog aspekta autorovog znanstvenog klimaksa. Potpuno isto značenje sadrže pojmovi: Liburni, Nin (*Aenona*), Radovin, Zadar (*Iader*), Delmati, Jadran, željezno doba, naravno, i sintagma *tra le sponde adriatiche*. Označavaju drugi kvalitativno ključni aspekt autorova djelovanja.

Kao što je neolitik dosljedno istraživao u najširem kulturnom kontekstu, na potezu

Adriatic Neolithic could already be discerned (G. Novak: Markova špilja on the island of Hvar, 1953; J. Korošec: Danilo: 1953-1954; A. Benac: Crvena stijena, 1953-1954, Zelena pećina, 1957). However Batović's discovery of Smilčić and the Smilčić *impresso* culture in 1956 was the missing link.

The role of Š. Batović was exceptionally important in the process of the first empirical (excavations) and theoretical rising of prehistoric archaeology in the eastern Adriatic and its hinterland that continued in the 1960s and 1970s. It was the beginning of a number of his analyses, studies and syntheses about the Adriatic Neolithic (*Stariji neolit u Dalmaciji*, Zadar, 1966; etc.) that definitely incorporated Adriatic and Croatian Neolithic archaeology into the European scientific standards and opened up meaningful discussions with archaeologists in the countries of former Yugoslavia (S. Dimitrijević, A. Benac, J. Korošec, T. Bregant, B. Čečuk and others) and established an important dialogue with the Italian Neolithic experts facilitating work of all younger researchers. These theses were complemented and reformulated but never significantly altered. His interpretations of the Neolithic cultural sequence Smilčić-Danilo-Hvar (Jadranska zona, Neolitsko doba, *Praistorija jugoslovenskih zemalja II*, Sarajevo 1979), and in particular the author's understanding of still relevant question of Neolithization of the Adriatic and Mediterranean have outlived their creator (*Néolithisation en Adriatique*. In: *Premières communautés paysannes en Méditerranée occidentale*, Paris 1987).

The first “keywords” for describing the work of Š. Batović are evidently Smilčić, Danilo, Hvar, Neolithic, Adriatic, Neolithization. They became a sort of synonyms, almost symbols of one aspect of the author's scientific climax. Identical meaning can be ascribed to the terms: Liburnians, Nin (*Aenona*), Radovin, Zadar (*Iader*), Delmatae, Adriatic, Iron Age, and inevitably the syntagm *tra le sponde adriatiche*. They denote the second crucial aspect

Jadran – Balkan/Podunavlje – Grčka – Italija, isto je tako komparativno interpretirao kulture željeznog doba na istočnoj jadranskoj obali, uvijek u pra/povijesnoj kulturnoj dinamici između Jadrana, Balkana, Apeninskog poluotoka. No, najprije je trebalo uspostaviti ono što je arheologiji Jadrana još u potpunosti nedostajalo – interpretativne sheme – prve kronologije i periodizacije svih zajednica od Istre do južnog Primorja tijekom I. tis. pr. Kr. Na početku svega stoji Nin. Potaknut zatečenim prijeratnim podacima o liburnskim pokopima u Ninu, Batović je već 1954. počeo istraživanje groblja, a od 1968. i ninskog naselja. Uz Radovin (1963.), bilo je to prvo šire iskapano naselje Liburna (1968. – 1970., 1988. – 1989.). Rezultati njegovih ninskih istraživanja, združeni s Batovićevim revaloriziranim prijeratnim ostacima ninskih groblja, postali su osnova prve znanstvene slike o Liburnima (*Die Eisenzeit auf dem Gebiet des illyrischen Stammes der Liburnen*, 1965.). Ona je bila prva sinteza jedne istočnojadranske kulture iz željeznog doba i jedna od najranijih na cijelom Jadranu, uz približno istovremenu, prvu modernu talijansku sintezu o Picenima (D. G. Lollini), i nešto starije sistematizacije venetskog i bolonjskog kruga. Ne samo da je bila osnovica daljnjeg istraživanja Liburna, već je postala obrazac za druge autorove sinteze: također prve moderne, opravdano skicizne, o kulturi histarskoj, delmatskoj i južnog Primorja (*Pregled željeznog doba na istočnoj jadranskoj obali, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku LXVIII*, 1973). Kasnije nadopunjena (Liburnska kulturna grupa, *Praistorija jugoslovenskih zemalja V*, Sarajevo, 1987.), još odolijeva vremenu.

Ovdje izdvojena samo dva kvalitativna i gotovo istovremena trenutka Batovićevog opusa tijekom 50/70-tih godina XX. stoljeća – neolitik i željezno doba – odražavaju trajne autorove osobine: pronicljivost u odabiru bitnoga, intuiciju i određenu hrabrost u znanstveno općenito nezahvalnom procesu

of the author's activity.

Just as he investigated Neolithic consistently in the widest cultural context, in the area of Adriatic – Balkans/Danube area – Greece – Italy, he also interpreted comparatively the Iron Age cultures on the eastern Adriatic coast, always in pre/historic cultural dynamics between the Adriatic, Balkans, Apennine Peninsula. The first thing he needed to establish were interpretative schemes – first chronologies and periodizations of all communities from Istria to the southern part of Primorje during the first millennium BC, as they were missing in archaeology of the Adriatic. Nin was the first site where he started excavations as early as 1954 incited by pre-war information on the Liburnian burials at the cemetery, and from 1968 excavations of the settlement began. In addition to Radovin (1963), this was the first extensively excavated settlement of the Liburnians (1968-1970, 1988-1989). The results of his research in Nin joined with data from pre-war excavations of the Nin cemeteries became a basis of the first scientific image of the Liburnians (*Die Eisenzeit auf dem Gebiet des illyrischen Stammes der Liburnen*, 1965). This was the first synthesis of an Iron Age culture from the eastern Adriatic coast and one of the earliest such publications in the entire Adriatic, alongside roughly simultaneous, first modern Italian synthesis about the Piceni (D. G. Lollini), and somewhat older systematization of the Veneto and Bologna circle. Not only was it a base for further research of the Liburnians but it became a pattern for other theses by Š. Batović: the first modern, though understandably sketchy synthesis about the Histrian and Delmatian culture, and the one about southern Primorje (*Pregled željeznog doba na istočnoj jadranskoj obali, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku LXVIII*, 1973). Subsequently supplemented (Liburnska kulturna grupa, *Praistorija jugoslovenskih zemalja V*, Sarajevo 1987) it still stands the test of time.

These two selected, almost simultaneous moments of Batović's work during the

stvaranja prvih sinteza, točnije shema i modela kulturnog toka. Jer, svako „pionirsko“ doba, posebice ono siromašno upotrebljivim podacima, nudi bezbrojne mogućnosti: nov i širok, dobrim dijelom znanstveno prazan prostor u kojemu je štošta olakšano i moguće, istovremeno i pogodno za promašaje, za sinteze preuranjene, u svakom slučaju, podložne promjenama. Godine 60/70-te ipak su bile i vrijeme općeg uzleta prapovijesne arheologije od Makedonije do Slovenije, i početak plodnih europskih arheoloških dijaloga, osobito „između dviju jadranskih obala“. U svima njima Batović je imao zavidno mjesto.

Odavno je istraživanje cijelog prapovijesnog toka anakron fenomen u našim i izvanjskim arheološkim tokovima a količina i raznovrsnost činjenica i tema, dakako, nisu znanstvene kvalitete *per se*. Međutim, upravo izrazito širok opseg Batovićevog znanstvenog predmeta, od paleolitika, enolitika do željeznog doba, još je jedna osebujnost njegovog opusa. Posebno je dojmljiva jer kod njega količina nikad nije nadomještala kvalitetu. Njegov iskaz uvijek je bio jasan, kratak, bez suvišnosti, stručno i znanstveno izravan i učinkovit. Iz dostupne, mahom škrte građe uvijek je izvlačio maksimum. O tome možda najslikovitije govore njegove rane i kasnije interpretacije slabo poznatih kultura brončanog doba, od cetinske do kulturnih zbivanja „kasne bronce“ između Jadrana i kontinenta.

Brojni su i njegovi „mali“ analitički radovi o jednoj gradini, jednom grobnom humku, jednom tipu artefakta – od nakita do oružja, o jednoj kulturnoj pojavi. O njegovoj radnoj energiji govore i bezbrojni stručni članci: terenske crtice i zabilješke s rekognosciranja, iskapanja, izvještaji i osvrti o nekoj izložbi, knjizi, znanstvenom skupu u zemlji i inozemstvu, o izdavačkoj djelatnosti, o arheološkom radu općenito u Hrvatskoj i drugdje. Njega je doslovno pratila izreka „veliki radnik“. Batović je uredno sve

1950s/1970s – Neolithic and the Iron Age – reflect author's constant traits: poignancy in recognizing the relevant, intuition and certain courage in scientifically ungrateful process of creating the first syntheses, more precisely schemes and models of cultural development because every “pioneering” period offers countless possibilities, particularly if useful information is scanty. Such times open new and wide but also scientifically empty space where certain possibilities are made easy and possible but at the same time prone to failures, and premature syntheses, in any case susceptible to changes. However the 1960s and 1970s were marked by general growth of prehistoric archaeology from Macedonia to Slovenia, and the beginning of productive European archaeological dialogues, in particular “between the two Adriatic coasts”. Batović played an important role in all of them.

Research of prehistoric development has been an anachronous phenomenon for a long time in local and foreign archaeological circles, and the amount and diversity of the facts and subjects are not scientific qualities *per se*. But it was exactly a wide scope of Batović's scientific subjects, from Palaeolithic, Eneolithic to the Bronze Age that is another special quality of his work. It is particularly impressive since quantity never substituted quality in his case. His expression was always clear, concise, without redundancies, professionally and scientifically direct and efficient. He always made the most of usually meager material. This is perhaps best illustrated by his early and later interpretations of poorly known Bronze Age cultures, from the Cetina culture to cultural phenomena of the “Late Bronze Age” between the Adriatic and the continent.

There is a number of his “little” analytical works about a hillfort, a burial mound, an artifact type – from jewelry to weapons, a cultural phenomenon. His working energy is illustrated by countless professional articles: field notes and records from field surveys, excavations, reports and reviews about a certain exhi-

bilježio na terenu i u kabinetu, nastojao sve dokumentirati, sistematizirati, ne da bi „služio“ činjenicama, već da bi se on ili netko drugi, jednog dana, njima mogao poslužiti u znanstvene svrhe, u promišljanju kulture, prapovijesne i recentne „narodne“ s ostacima prošlosti.

Njegov pristup kulturi, ma kako ga nazvali, govori da je pojam kulture, on široko i duboko spoznao i pojmio. U skladu s polazištima i terminologijom „Nove arheologije“ od 60-tih godina naovamo, arheološku paradigmu Š. Batovića trebalo bi označiti kao tradicionalnu i taksonomsku, okrenutu periodizaciji, kronologiji, razvoju, procesima kulturno-etničkog širenja te artefaktu kao kulturnom entitetu *sui generis*. U svojim najkreativnijim trenucima arheologija Š. Batovića jest „tradicionalna“, no u potpuno pozitivnom smislu, dakle, kompatibilna s istovremenim ključnim europskim prapovijesnim paradigmama, relevantnim i za naš prostor, na čelu s H. Müller-Karpeom, K. Kilianom, R. Peronijem, A. Radmillijem, L. Bernabò Breom i mnogim drugima. Uostalom, svojevremeno (opravdano) najgorljiviji arheološki europski skeptici u vezi s mogućnostima arheologije u građenju „generalne“ teorije ugasle kulture, primjerice S. Piggott, napisali su svoje velike europske sinteze 60/70-tih godina bez bitnog odmak od arheološke „tradicionalnosti“. Batović je do kraja djelovanja ostao vjeran svom pristupu prapovijesnoj kulturi, ne opterećujući se time koliko u njemu ima neoevolucionizma, difuzionizma, funkcionalizma, možda strukturalizma, ili nekog drugog -izma. Činjenica je da su ga oduvijek ipak najviše zanimala arheološke realije. To je u skladu s vremenom njegova znanstvenog oblikovanja i njegovih najkreativnijih dometa, dakako, i prirodom tadanje „čiste“ arheologije, još nedovoljno otvorene drugim humanističkim te društvenim znanostima, s kojima ona stanovito dijeli predmet istraživanja, koje su, nekad i danas, i same prepune poticajnih

bition, book, scientific conference in country or abroad, publishing activity, archaeological work in general in Croatia and elsewhere. He was a genuine hard worker. Batović recorded everything neatly in the excavations and his study, he tried to document and systematize everything, not to “serve” the facts but to make them available so that some day he or someone else might use them for scholarly purposes, in considering prehistoric and recent “national” culture on the basis of the relics of the past.

In accordance with principles and terminology of the “New Archaeology” from the 1960s onwards Š. Batović’s archaeological paradigm should be defined as traditional and taxonomic, oriented to periodization, chronology, development, processes of cultural and ethnical spreading and an artifact as a cultural entity *sui generis*. In his most creative moments archaeology of Š. Batović is “traditional”, but in a positive sense, meaning that it is compatible with crucial simultaneous European prehistoric paradigms, relevant for our region as well, headed by H. Müller-Karpe, K. Kilian, R. Peroni, A. Radmilli, L. Bernabò Brea and many others. After all the most ardent European archaeological skeptics regarding the possibilities of archaeology in creating a “general” theory of an extinct culture, e.g. S. Piggott, wrote their big European syntheses in the 1960s/1970s without an important deviation from archaeological “traditionality”. Until the end of his work Batović remained faithful to his approach to prehistoric culture, without being preoccupied with influences of neoevolutionism, diffusionism, functionalism, possibly structuralism, or some other -ism. His approach to culture, always constant, no matter how we might call it, shows that he studied the notion of culture, past and present, at length, comprehended it and finally understood it. The fact is that he had always been preoccupied with archaeological realities. This is in accordance with time of his scientific formation and his most creative achievements, and nature of “pure” archaeology of the time, still insufficiently open to other

sumnji i dilema u definiraju pojma kulture.

Nije samo Š. Batović bio duboko svjestan manjkave društvene sklonosti hrvatskoj arheološkoj znanosti. „Nikada nismo izborili niti stvorili uvjete za suvremeni i svestrani razvoj arheologije“, izjavio je u *Zadarskom listu* 2002. godine, prigodom preuzimanja jednog od više dodijeljenih mu priznanja: nagrade *Don Frane Bulić* za životno znanstveno djelo Hrvatskog arheološkog društva. Ipak, bez malodušnosti, on je od početka do kraja vjerovao u svoju i arheologiju općenito. Između ostalog, odavno i uspješno nadrastao je činjenicu da ga nije dopala titula *academicus* pri HAZU-u, za koju se, na poziv, svojevremeno natjecao. Njegova utemeljena, tiha znanstvena samosvijest i, unatoč svemu, možda je ono što je ponajprije fasciniralo njegove učenike i sljedbenike tijekom njegovih najuspješnijih, no i kasnih godina. Neki od njih, svojim priložima u ovoj *Archaeologia Adriatici*, također i u nedavnoj *Diadori* (*Batovićev zbornik*, Zadar 2013.), prisjećaju se svoga mentora i kolege.

humanistic and social sciences with which it shares the subject of study to a certain degree. However these sciences have been and still are full of stimulative doubts and dilemmas in defining the notion of culture.

Š. Batović was aware of unfavourable social circumstances for Croatian archaeology. “We have never fought for or created conditions for modern and versatile development of archaeology”, he said in *Zadarski list* in 2002 when he received one of the awards he was given - *Don Frane Bulić Lifetime Achievement Award*. However without being dispirited, he believed in his and general archaeology from the beginning to the end. Among other things, he overcame the fact that he was not given the title of Academician by the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, although he was nominated. His silent but justified scientific self-confidence might be the traits that fascinated his students and followers in his most successful and subsequent years. Some of them, with their contributions in this *Adriatica*, as well as in recent *Diadora* (*Batovićev zbornik*, Zadar 2013), remember their mentor and colleague.

Translation: Marija Kostić

