



Baština Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine

Godišnjak 47: Godišnjak/Jahrbuch

Govedarica, Blagoje

2018

Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine

<https://bastina.anubih.ba/items/aa16c3b7-e5c4-4967-b559-e52df8a12b97>

Preuzeto s Baštine Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine

<https://bastina.anubih.ba/>

Socioeconomic relations and identities in the Southeastern Adriatic Iron Age

*Milijan Dimitrijević*¹
Belgrade

Abstract: The focus of this paper is on the connections between socioeconomic relations and collective identities in the Late Iron Age communities from the Southeastern Adriatic and its hinterland. The aim is to draw attention to different perceptions of collective identity in the distant past, in contrast to the traditional view that typically focuses on ethnicity as the main expression of identity in the Late Iron Age Southeastern Adriatic. This interpretation is based on a constructivist approach to culture and on a re-evaluation of archaeological records that are significantly marked with imported artefacts, which remarkably highlight socioeconomic interactions from the past. By correlating archaeological data and previously proposed theoretical concepts, it will be concluded that the conceptions of collective identities in this particular social context in the past were considerably embedded in socioeconomic relations. Such conceptions, partly understood through various social practices including the consumption of material culture, were significantly articulated through socioeconomic interactions (e.g., warfare, habitation, goods exchange) rather than through notions of ethnic distinctions between individuals and groups in the past.

Key words: identity, Iron Age, socioeconomic relations, eastern Adriatic, Illyrians

1. Introduction

Following the constructivist reasoning that social structure and “reality” are not predetermined or fixed but continuously socially constructed, together with the notion of a “strong reflexive tie” between social dispositions and produced knowledge of these arrangements,² it can be concluded that our understanding of society in the distant past is inevitably conditioned by contemporary social values. Therefore, as such, this understanding is a fluid and ambiguous conception.

This phenomenon has been prominently articulated through the understanding of identity in archaeology and modern historiography.³ And it is strikingly clear apropos the traditional in-

terpretation of collective identities in the central and western Balkan Iron Age,⁴ which typically was focused on ethnicity and identified a significant part of the prehistoric population in the region as the “ancient Illyrians.”⁵

However, the focus of this paper is on the connections between socioeconomic relations and identities of people in the Southeastern Adriatic and its close hinterland in the Late Iron Age.⁶ This topic principally relates to collective iden-

⁴ Dzino 2008; Kuzmanović / Vranić 2013.

⁵ Velimirović-Žižić 1967; Papazoglu 1969; Anamali / Korkuti 1970; Korkuti 1972a; 1976; Benac 1972; Bojanovski 1985; Čović 1987; 1991; Benac 1987; Garašanin 1988; Vasić 1991; Mirdita 1991; Mikić 1991; Ceka 2005.

⁶ With regard to the periodization of late prehistory, it has been suggested that the beginning of the Late Iron Age in the Eastern Adriatic should be dated earlier than in the Central Balkans, probably to the 4th century BC. This argument has been based on the cultural interaction with the rest of the Mediterranean, intense cultural exchange reflected through imported archaeological material, and the influence of “Hellenization”, argued to have been a crucial cultural change in this historical and social context. For Iron

¹ B.A. (University of Belgrade), Ph.D. (University of Belgrade), Project Researcher, Pannonia Project, The University of Sydney. The author wishes to thank John Whitehouse of The University of Sydney for advice in composing this paper.

² Berger / Luckmann 1991 [1966]; Bourdieu 1995 [1972]; Giddens 1984; Ashmore 1989; Bourdieu 1989.

³ Jones 1997; Babić 2010.

tities in the past, and it is concerned with social and cultural aspects of this phenomenon, bearing in mind the consumption of material culture within the specific socioeconomic setting;⁷ it is not concerned with ontological or psychological analyses.

Reflecting on the notion indicated in the first paragraph of this text, I would express prudence that some of the arguments conveyed here could imply doxastic ways of thinking. However, the purpose of this paper is to draw the reader's attention to the different perception of collective identities in the region during the late prehistory, in contrast to the traditional view.

Considering the types and contextual information of archaeological finds referred to in the text, it is noteworthy to point out that collective identifications in the Late Iron Age of the South-eastern Adriatic and its hinterland were materially embedded in socioeconomic interactions and relationships set in the distant past. These interactions from the past are indicated through the archaeological record from sites dispersed throughout the region. They are overwhelmingly dominated by imports, which were more intensely exchanged from the 4th century BC onward. Some illustrative examples are the sites of Ošanići, Risan, Budva, Lezhë, Zgërdhesh, Mar-gëlliç, Hekal, Klos, Ploç, and Krotina.⁸

Hence, to test whether socioeconomic interactions were one of the determining forces for a creation of collective identities in a given social context in the past, it is necessary to explain how material culture and identity of people were interrelated, while keeping in mind the given archaeological record.

2. Identity – meaning – material culture and vice versa

The constructivist understanding of culture has had a major influence on archaeological inter-

pretations, including our understanding of identities in the distant past.⁹ This comes hand in hand with the understanding of material culture as a culturally specific sign and a medium within culture.¹⁰

In archaeology, this idea has originated from the theory of semiotics;¹¹ especially important are those concepts of Charles Peirce.¹² One of Peirce's crucial notions in his theory of continuous creations of signs and meanings is that a sign is not isolated but is consistently related with other signs, which enable their creation in the first place.¹³ Therefore, in the context of social relations and culture, signs can represent not just social "reality", but can also create social "reality" through meanings, which can always be ambiguously reinterpreted.¹⁴ Peirce's notion of cultural construction of identity suggests that it emerges simultaneously from relations between signs, people's interactions, and individual comprehension. Hence, identity coexists in the understandings of both a group and a person and is therefore constantly fluid and reinterpreted, not fixed.¹⁵

Accordingly, Fredrik Barth's understanding of collective identity has underlined the importance of social interaction in the construction of always fluid identities as well as the significance of social processes of inclusion and exclusion within a particular social group.¹⁶ In other words, identity is not fixed and primordial, but continuously negotiated through comparisons of self with the other.

Furthermore, following Pierre Bourdieu's *Theory of Practice*, identity can be understood as being constantly and recursively (re)constructed through various social practices and their meanings. Identity is simultaneously one of the causes and outcomes of interactions between groups and individuals, as well as their perceptions of these relations in social space, in which notions of various social practices and positions recur-

Age periodization see Garašanin 1988, 120–121; cf. Čović 1987, 633–634.

⁷ On material culture consumption in the past see Gosden 2002, 152–178; 2005; Morely 2007, 36–54.

⁸ Basler 1969; Anamali 1972; Dautaj 1972; 1975; 1976; Marić 1973a; 1977; 1973b; Papajani 1973; 1975; Prendi 1975a; Karaiskaj 1977–1978; Ceka 1990; 2005; Vrekaj 1997; Ujes 1999; Dyczek et al. 2004; 2007; Dyczek 2010; Marković 2012.

⁹ Hodder 1985; Tilley 1994; Olsen 2002 [1997]; Dornan 2002; Hodder / Hutson 2003; Gosden 2005; Meskell 2012. Compare with Bourdieu 1995 [1972]; Giddens 1984.

¹⁰ Olsen 2002, 165–182.

¹¹ Ibid. 165; Preucel 2006. Compare with: Eco 1976.

¹² Eco 1976, 15; Preucel 2006, 45.

¹³ Preucel 2006, 49–50. 52–55. 57. 66.

¹⁴ Ibid. 89.

¹⁵ Ibid. 79–84.

¹⁶ Barth 1969, 9–10.

sively produce social identity comprehensions and vice versa.¹⁷

Keeping in mind all these insights, one can conclude that collective identities are fluid categories under constant (re)construction. They are the results of repeatedly constructed perceptions, which when looked at from a chronological distance constitute a “tradition” (evocation) that recursively supports various expressions of these identities (verbal, behavioural, material, etc.) in a particular moment or interval of time during which they are manifested within society. Hence, social and cultural identity can be understood as an awareness of “otherness” of individuals and groups in comparison to other individuals or other groups. This awareness is constructed and repeatedly reconstructed through the ongoing interactions with the surroundings.

One’s sense of social and cultural identity is conditioned by many different notions or distinct understandings related to the perceptions and comparisons of self or selves with the others. Cultural elaboration and the awareness of one’s age, gender, sex, name, social background and position, place of origin, mother tongue, political stance, occupation, economic power, religion, material possessions, and similar are also associated with the understanding of the different interactions between people.¹⁸ In human interaction, these complex associations are constantly, both consciously and unconsciously, communicated and compared, which then reflectively and recursively enables the understanding of distinctions between individuals and groups of people within social space.

One of many ways of communicating these ideas is through the usage of material culture. It has been argued that objects that people use do not just have their practical function, but also have culturally specific and varied meanings in human interaction and perception.¹⁹ Hence, different objects and ways of their usage may reflect one’s perception of self in comparison to the other. The various ways of using material culture in prehistory and the permanent psychological and social reproductions of mixed identifications can be related to the different contexts of con-

sumption of objects as well as the miscellaneous meanings associated with their usage.²⁰

Hence, material culture can be a culturally specific representation of a hybrid, individual, and collective identifications, as well as a sign of a mixed and layered notion of social and cultural identities.

3. Socioeconomic practices and identities (re)constructed

Following the conceptions outlined above, one can argue that the key to understanding the interrelatedness between socioeconomic practices and collective identities in the past is the recognition of specific socioeconomic groups created through practices as well as paradigms of class distinctions materialised as a result of actions within a particular social context.

These notions indicate the focal points for social recognition and identification in the past, including the phenomenon by which the social actors compare themselves with others. This can be related to their inclusion in, or exclusion from a particular group, while being related to concerns with one’s status, reputation and wealth, which are constantly weighted against other individuals and groups. Such comparisons are partially embedded in socioeconomic interactions.

Being partly (re)constructed in various ways of consumption of material culture in the past, identities can be traced in the archaeological record by reconstructing paths of various artefacts in the archaeological context. In order to understand this interrelatedness, it is crucial to relate archaeological contexts with the specific past social contexts, by identifying social practices which form the basis for the construction of collective identities.

Following on from this, the study will finalize with conclusions based on relating archaeological data to theoretical conceptions and vice versa.²¹ Hence, the first step is to provide an overview of the material culture from the Southeastern Adriatic and its immediate hinterland dating to the 4th–1st centuries BC. Specifically, imports will be taken into consideration, as they are over-

¹⁷ Bourdieu 1995 [1972]; Ibid 1985, 725.

¹⁸ Meskell 2012.

¹⁹ Olsen 2002, 165–182. 199–200; Dornan 2002, 305–307.

²⁰ Gosden 2002, 152–178; Gosden 2005; Morely 2007, 36–54.

²¹ Jones 2002, 25. 36–37. 70–71.

whelmingly present and are typologically and chronologically more sensitive. Moreover, they are objects that were clearly part of past socio-economic exchange.

3.1. Material culture overview

Abundance of artefacts, predominantly various Mediterranean imports, rested within the remains of numerous Iron Age fortified settlements and necropoleis in the Southeastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland, highlight socioeconomic interactions from the region's late prehistory.

The consumption of imports in the region can be traced throughout the Early Iron Age.²² But an increase in the quantity of this archaeological material can be dated from the late 5th / early 4th century BC onward. The change and increase in their quantity is the consequence of intensification of their consumption and a sign of intensified socioeconomic interactions in the region in the last four centuries of the first millennium BC. Imported objects, in the traditional interpretation signified "Hellenised" material culture, predominantly originating from the workshops in the Southern Italy and Sicily but also from the Aegean Region.

Those artefacts include various metal fibulae, buttons, necklaces, earrings, bracelets, rings, pins and double pins; amphorae (Greco – Italic, Corinthian A and B types, Dressel types – 1A, 1B, 2–4, Brindisi, Knidian, Thasian, Laboglia 2, Apollonian, etc.); fine ceramic vessels (skyphoi, oenochoi, pelike, craters, unguentaria, etc. – predominantly Gnathia pottery, also Megarian bowls, etc.); metal vessels (oenochoi, cups, etc.); coins (of Philip II, Alexander the Great, Cassander, Philip V, Demetrius II; Acragas coins, Syracuse coins, Neapolis coins, Corinth coins, Korkyra coins, Apollonia coins, Dyrrachion coins, etc.).²³ Among these imported artefacts some originated from the inner Balkans territory and even from the southern rim of the Pannonian

plain; mostly coins (for an example, Damastion coins) and fibulae (identified as various La Tène types).²⁴ Besides, many local products have been labelled as imitations of imports.

This label was especially related to the coins attributed to various groups from distinct settlements (Amantia, Byllis, Olympe, Orikos, Daorson, Scodra, Lissos, Rhizon, etc.); and signed by individuals – rulers (coins of Monunius, Genthios, Ballaios, etc.).²⁵ In addition, these imitations have been recognized in the abundance of fine pottery fragments (cups, oenochoi, etc.) predominantly similar to Gnathia products, reflecting stylistic features of imported objects.²⁶ This emulative aspect has been also more or less pointed out regarding some of the remains of architecture in the region, especially some fortifications – identified as "Hellenistic" (Ošanići, Risan, Lezhë, Hekal, Krotina, Klos, Triport, Orikos, Ploç, Zgërdhesh, Margëlliç, etc.).²⁷

Locally produced artefacts also include various kitchen potteries for everyday use (so called "Illyrian" pottery), mostly cups with one or two handles, bowls, pots; pithoi and amphorae; predominantly made without using a wheel (cups, pots, etc.) or in some cases produced with the usage of a wheel (amphorae).²⁸ Among local products are various metal tools, mostly for agricultural works, and craftsmanship.²⁹

A great number of finds relate to weapons produced locally, but there are also imported ones. Offensive weapons are present in a large quantity (iron long leaf-like spears, curved iron knives, arrow heads and short swords); defensive weapons were found in small numbers (and comprise mostly Illyrian helmets).³⁰

²² Prendi 1975b; Čović 1987; Vasić 1987; Палавестра 1989; Palavestra 1993; Babić 2002; Бабић 2004; Ceka 2005.

²³ Basler 1969; Korkuti 1971, 138; 1972b; Anamali 1972; Dautaj 1972; 1975; 1976; Marić 1973a; 1973b; 1977; Papajani 1973; 1975; Mano 1975; Prendi 1975a; Karaiskaj 1977–1978; Паровић-Пешикан 1979; Popović 1987, 96–104; Batović 1988; Ceka 1990; 2005; Kirigin 1994; Vrekaj 1997; Ujes 1999; 2010; Katić 1999–2000; 2000–2001; 2002; Dyczek et al. 2004; Kirigin et al. 2005; Dyczek et al. 2007; Dyczek 2010; Marković 2012.

²⁴ Basler 1969; Popović 1987, 28–29; Batović 1988; Marković 2012.

²⁵ Islami 1966; Rendić-Miočević 1965; Basler 1971; Ceka 1972; Islami 1972b; Marić 1973b; Papajani 1976b; Popović 1987, 8. 87–96; Ujes 2004; Dyczek 2010.

²⁶ Basler 1969, 7; Korkuti 1971, 138; Marić 1977, 42–43; Vrekaj 1997, 169; Ujes 1999, 209; Marković 2012 61–62.

²⁷ Islami 1972a; 1972d; 1975b; 1975c; Prendi / Zheku 1972; Papajani 1976a; Suić 1976; Karaiskaj 1981; Dyczek et al. 2010; Ceka 1987; 1989; 1990; 1998; 2005; Димитријевић 2015.

²⁸ Korkuti 1971, 137; Anamali 1972, 101; Dautaj 1972, 153; Papajani 1973, 110; Prendi 1975a, 154; Marić 1977, 8; Паровић-Пешикан 1979, 47; Vrekaj 1997, 168–169.

²⁹ Prendi 1975a; Паровић-Пешикан 1979; Marić 1979.

³⁰ Basler 1969; Islami 1972a; Korkuti 1972b; Prendi 1975a; Паровић-Пешикан 1979; Batović 1988; Marković 2012.

Bearing in mind overviewed archaeological finds, crucial questions arise such as how are they correlated to particular social practices in the past, and how ideas of collective identities in that particular social context were affected through those practices?

3.2. Warfare and habitation

A large amount of weapons (for the most part offensive ones) found particularly in funerary context, but also within settlements, and in stratigraphic layers of destruction (for instance in Ošanići),³¹ indicate the vital importance of warfare in the Southeastern Adriatic and its hinterland during the Late Iron Age. Remains of a great number of fortified settlements that once dominated these landscapes, moreover suggest a situation of insecurity and the need for protection in the distant past.

This is clearly communicated in the ancient written sources (books of Polybius and Livy-);³² and in the works of modern historiography, warfare, including piracy, is denoted as a real economic activity in this historical context, a so called war economy.³³ In relation to this one should also consider the increase of mercenary activities in conflicts in Greece and Hellenistic east from the 4th century BC onward.³⁴ Ancient authors such as Polybius and Diodorus Siculus have mentioned Illyrians and groups from the eastern Adriatic in this context.³⁵

If comprehended within substantivist argumentation,³⁶ warfare without doubt was a socioeconomic practice in this social context in the past; which principally included plunder of the defeated parties. Furthermore, judging from the archaeological remains of fortified settlements in the Southeastern Adriatic and its hinterland dated in the last centuries BC, one may conclude that habitation in that particular social context was inextricably interrelated to warfare and plun-

der, in addition to the other aspects of habitation and occupancy within prehistoric settlements.³⁷

Analysing the positions of these fortified settlements in the Southeastern Adriatic and its close hinterland, one may conclude that they do not represent points in landscapes that were connected; neither with roads, nor through their spatial positioning that would suggest their arranged orientation opposing some mutual threat. The micro regional topography of the eastern Adriatic and its closest hinterland along with the positions of those settlements in the landscapes indicate that the biggest threat for an Iron Age community in this region was from their neighbours.³⁸

Bearing all this in mind, it can be concluded that socioeconomic practices of warfare and plunder, along with a habitation aspect that was strikingly marked with practices of erecting fortifications and living within a community in a particular defensible place, resulted in the creation of distinct socioeconomic groups and were among focal points for social recognition and identification in the past. These circumstances in that particular social context in the past, recursively influenced the comprehension of group identities which in turn reinforced these practices. Some of those local identities were even explicitly communicated on marked coins produced in some of the settlements.³⁹

As previously mentioned, the finds of mostly offensive weapons are in general known from funerary contexts. This suggests their importance in the given social context as objects for conducting important socioeconomic practices – warfare and plunder, as well as defence of a distinct group or a (fortified) settlement. And even if these activities would not have been obligatory or would not be obvious for some individuals within those communities in the past (examples of finds of weapons in graves of women), those practices were certainly strongly suggested within that social context, and those individuals undoubtedly

³¹ Marić 1969, 78; 1977, 48.

³² Pol. II 6; II 8; V 4; Liv. XLIV 30.

³³ Papazoglu 1988, 180.

³⁴ Miller 1984.

³⁵ Pol. II 2; II 10; V 2; V 3; V 4; Diod. XVII 17.

³⁶ Polanyi 2001 [1944]; 1977; see also: Adams 1974; Compare with particular stances regarding ancient economy in the primitivist historiography: Finley 1973.

³⁷ These other aspects concern relations between habitation of a community and its practices of common goods production within householding and reciprocal exchange of these goods within particular settlements. On this matter see: Polanyi 2001 [1944]; 1977.

³⁸ Димитријевић 2015.

³⁹ Islami 1966; 1972b; Rendić-Miočević 1965; Basler 1971; Ceka 1972; Marić 1973b; Papajani 1976b; Popović 1987, 8. 87–96; Ujes 2004; Dyczek 2010.

alluded to on warrior's appearances through the attributes of clothing.

Sepulchral practice suggests the importance of these objects for social recognition in this historical context, and indicates significance of weapons for differentiation of social status of deceased persons, considering their overwhelming presence within burial places but with differences in their quantity and quality. Status communicated in this way, that is through possessing and using weapons within particular socioeconomic practices, led to differentiations among social actors which were one of the presumptions for creating ideas of their distinct identities.

A customary epilogue of the socioeconomic practice of warfare and plunder apparently was the exchange of looted goods. As one of the practices in this social context, redistribution of some goods (although not all of them looted), and even redistribution of land, is suggested by ancient written sources.⁴⁰ In relation to this, archaeological records suggest socioeconomic networking between social actors who communicated different social status through consumption of exchanged material culture in the past.

3.3. Socioeconomic exchange and networking

Socioeconomic practice of exchange of goods and objects in the past can be displayed through distribution analysis of archaeological material. In this respect, some types of imports like amphorae, fine pottery and coins are of particular importance because of their well known origins and chronology. After being imported to the region, they had to be exchanged, that is redistributed.

A mathematical model which indicates redistribution of artefacts in the past was previously formulated by C. Renfrew.⁴¹ This model shows that if there is an increased quantity of particu-

lar type of artefacts on a particular location at a distance from its production centre, and decreased concentration of these objects on other sites further away, then this pattern of spread indicates their centralised redistribution from that particular place in the past. When the quantity of particular imports to the Southeastern Adriatic is evaluated and compared, the pattern explained above could be recognised at particular sites in the region, indicating some of the centres of redistribution of various imports, mostly of amphorae (containing wine and olive oil) and fine pottery (mostly for consumption of wine): Ošanići, Risan, Lezhë, Margëlliç, Krotina, Berat, Hekal, Klos, Ploç, Orikum, Triport.⁴² Amphorae are present in largest amounts when compared to the other objects, and are almost exclusively found in settlements (and rarely in the funerary context).

Bearing in mind that the imported artefacts had different origins, their geographical spread over the region in both settlements and necropoleis suggests that they were redistributed from particular places in the Southeastern Adriatic and its surroundings. In addition, the widespread presence of so called imitations of "Hellenistic" material, mostly locally produced ("Illyrian") coins, fine pottery and amphorae suggest their local manufacture at distribution places and subsequent redistribution in the past. Considering the origins of these products, many of the centres mentioned above can be identified as places from which these objects had been distributed.

Numerous finds of so called "Illyrian" coins in particular support this pattern of exchange⁴³ – if their role is understood in substantivist terms as "special purpose money" in regulating particular spheres of exchange.⁴⁴ Locally produced coins by centres or individuals / groups, were distributed to many different locations (and hence to other socioeconomic actors) along with imported

⁴⁰ In ancient Amantia (Ploç in southern Albania) the redistribution of olive oil is documented on the epigraphic monument dated in the 2. century BC: Anamali 1972, 90–93; Strabo in the fifth chapter of the seventh book of his *Geographica* noted periodical redistribution of land between ancient Delmatae (every eight years): p. VII 5, 5; compare with Šašel-Kos 2008, 623. Additionally, Aristotle in the second chapter of the second book of his *Politics* also noted that among "some barbarians" goods are redistributed: Arist. 1263a.

⁴¹ Renfrew / Bahn 1991, 322–325.

⁴² Korkuti 1971; 1972b; Anamali 1972; Dautaj 1972; 1975; 1976; Marić 1973a; 1973b; 1977; Papajani 1973; 1975; Mano 1975; Prendi 1975a; Karaiskaj 1977–1978; Паровић-Пешикан 1979; Ceka 1990; 2005; Kirigin 1994; Vrekaj 1997; Ujes 1999; Dyczek et al. 2004; Kirigin et al. 2005; Dyczek et al. 2007; Marković 2012.

⁴³ Islami 1966; 1972b; Rendić-Miočević 1965; Basler 1971; Ceka 1972; Marić 1973b; Papajani 1976b; Popović 1987, 8. 87–96; Ujes 2004; Dyczek 2010.

⁴⁴ Polanyi 1977, 97–121; compare with: Finley 1973, 141–142; Morely 2007, 61–64.

coins, and these often were deposited together in the same stratigraphic layers. This pattern actually shows that exchange and their usage (distribution and redistribution) was centralised by numerous producers, whose regulation of this particular practice overlapped with other producers each supplying the same socioeconomic actors in the past, as well as their socioeconomic influences in general.

Bearing in mind all these insights, it can be concluded that redistribution and distribution of goods and objects were widely accepted socioeconomic practices in the Southeastern Adriatic in the last centuries BC. Redistribution, as an institutionalised and centralized form of exchange,⁴⁵ apparently included competing socioeconomic networking in the past. This meant the creation of distinct parts of social structures that regulated the practice of redistributive exchange – a network of socioeconomic actors, replicating through this practice. The distinctions between social actors (individuals and smaller groups, for example families – *gentes*) within the exchange networks that were formed in this way must have been made in terms of their inclusion in, or exclusion out of, these clusters or groups created through practices.

These socioeconomic differentiations between social actors can be distinguished by their presence or absence within the practice of exchange. Consequently, this would lead to their mutual recognition and identification. Some of these collective “socioeconomic” identities were “locally” (re)produced through exchange practices within a particular settlement and/or within a group of close settlements. This is indicated with finds of mostly amphorae (redistribution and distribution of wine and olive oil) and imported fine pottery (mostly for consumption of wine), present in many of mentioned sites and dispersed in patterns that display centralised redistribution of these goods.⁴⁶ Consequently, such patterns can indicate the existence of so-

cioeconomic groups and can be correlated with their members’ participations within particular exchange networks and therefore also their socioeconomic identification.

Hence, these relations constructed through practices of exchange – distribution and redistribution of goods and objects – have been one of the ways of recognition of self and the other, that is, recognition of participant and non-participant in socioeconomic practices. Consequently, it must have been one of the features of identity regarding that particular group (an exchange network) within the given social context. Dominant social actors (individuals and/or groups) constructed their high status within these networks through practice of regulation of exchange, which apparently was in accordance with other social and identity notions like kin based relations, political dealings, etc. They apparently have constructed a distinct identity in comparison to others. In some cases this was vividly communicated with distinct images and names minted in coins.⁴⁷

Inclusion of many other social actors as participants within these networks of exchange is suggested by the presence of previously exchanged artefacts found in different settlements, and in great number of burials in the region – mostly coins, fine pottery vessels, fibulae and jewellery.⁴⁸ Those finds in a number of graves unearthed in the region indicates connections of buried individuals to the networks of particular spheres of exchange in the past. Related to that is the recognition of some of collective socioeconomic identities as having been (re)produced through exchange on a regional level, including interaction between individuals and groups settled in a larger area in different settlements but connected through the possession and usage of the same type of exchanged objects. In particular, this practice refers again to coins of distinct types, dispersed widely in the region and far away from the places of their origin, which were found in funerary context.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Polanyi 2001, 47–48; 1977, 38–39.

⁴⁶ Basler 1969; Korkuti 1971; 1972b; Anamali 1972; Dautaj 1972; 1975; 1976; Marić 1973a; 1973b; 1977; Papajani 1973; 1975; Mano 1975; Prendi 1975a; Karaiskaj 1977–1978; Паровић-Пешикан 1979; Batović 1988; Ceka 1990; 2005; Kirigin 1994; Vrekaj 1997; Ujes 1999; Dyczek et al. 2004; Kirigin / Katunić / Šešelj, 2005; Dyczek et al. 2007; Marković 2012.

⁴⁷ Islami 1966; 1972b; Rendić-Miočević 1965; Basler 1971; Ceka 1972; Marić 1973b; Papajani 1976b; Popović 1987, 8. 87–96; Ujes 2004; Dyczek 2010.

⁴⁸ Basler 1969; Anamali 1972; Marković 2012.

⁴⁹ Islami 1966; 1972b; Rendić-Miočević 1965; Basler 1971; Ceka 1972; Marić 1973b; Papajani 1976b; Popović 1987, 8. 87–96; Ujes 2004; Dyczek 2010.

This seems to indicate the importance of placing artefacts during sepulchral practices for the deceased and for conveying his/her socioeconomic connection to the producer within a particular network of exchange during his/her lifetime. The different socioeconomic status of social actors can be suggested on the basis of the quality and quantity of finds in the graves. All these notions and the constructed mental pictures within the minds of social actors in the past, and in-between their (socioeconomic) relations (group mind set), would influence ideas of identities – deflected through these connections and practices of their (re)construction.

4. Some critical remarks on the traditional interpretation of identity in the Central Balkans Iron Age

The traditional understanding and interpretation of group identities regarding central and western Balkan Iron Age is typically focused on ethnicity.⁵⁰ Some explanations touched upon the questions of vertical social diversification and implicitly suggested different social identifications in the past.⁵¹ Even some political and socioeconomic distinctions between particular communities in the past were put forward.⁵²

All of these notions have been based on different understandings of social and cultural evolution; as well as on different concepts and models of the economy in the distant past. In any case, the dominant approach to identity pivots around Iron Age populations being identified as “ancient Illyrians”.

4.1. Establishing “Illyrian” ethnicity

The traditional archaeological interpretation describes the ancient Illyrians as the dominant population in the Southeastern Adriatic and its hinterland during the last centuries BC. It is the widely accepted opinion that this region was inhabited with ethnically related Illyrian tribes, at least from the Late Bronze Age, the period from

which on their ethnogenesis has been traced with certainty according to archaeological finds classified as the Glasinac – Mati cultural complex.⁵³

The Illyrians have been predominantly seen as related, or at least allied tribes, united by their emphasis on shared ethnic background, which was a focal point of their identity. It is believed that this ethnic bonding culminated in the period from the end of the 4th BC onward, when the Southeastern Adriatic and its hinterland became parts of the so called “Illyrian Kingdom”; just before the gradual Roman conquest and expansion over the Balkans.⁵⁴

This socio-political phenomenon (a creation of a state) was understood as social evolution, a gradual social progress through the centuries that came to a crescendo with a creation of a kingdom, in which ethnic identity was one of the most important factors of political and social cohesion. This traditional viewpoint of ethnicity in the Balkans during the late prehistory is clearly founded on the normative model of culture, and namely on the concept of archaeological culture and diffusionism.⁵⁵

The archaeological verification of this view is undertaken in terms of identifying the supposed complex correlation of homogeneous artefacts (with well-defined characteristics) distributed through a distinct territory, the specific cultural norms of particular group of people (e.g., language, religion, customs, all described by these features of classified material culture), and collective identities (that were embodied through the use of a distinct material culture by a particular group of people, who shared the same specific cultural norms). That view is really an implicit projection of modern ideas of ethnicity, the nation, and the state is strongly supported by the contrasting culture-historical interpretations of the given subject. The different Balkan archaeologies that explored and modelled the past of the region: Austro-Hungarian, Albanian, Yugoslavian, and so on, gave different understandings of the expansion, cohesion and continuity of cul-

⁵⁰ Velimirović-Žižić 1967; Papazoglu 1969; Anamali / Korkuti 1970; Korkuti 1972a; 1976; Benac 1972; 1987; Bojanovski 1985; Čović 1987; 1991; Garašanin 1988; Vasić 1991; Mirdita 1991; Mikić 1991; Ceka 2005.

⁵¹ Vasić 1987; Čović 1987; Papazoglu 1988; Бабић 2004.

⁵² Anamali 1965; Ceka 1984; Dautaj 1986.

⁵³ Čović 1987.

⁵⁴ Islami 1972c; 1975a; 1976; Papazoglu 1988; Cabanes 1988; Wilkes 1992.

⁵⁵ On some critical remarks regarding this matter see: Jones 1997; Olsen 2002, 32–35; Compare to Babić 2010.

tural norms related to the Illyrian (ethnic) identity or identities.⁵⁶

Historical and modern political narratives often were intertwined in the explanation of the past in which Illyrian ethnic identity was understood differently depending on contemporary socio-political circumstances. Considering that these different explanations emerged from one and the same archaeological data and the very same research methodology;⁵⁷ these differences in the interpretation are obviously paradoxical. A comparison of archaeological and written records in addition coloured the view and highlighted ethnic distinctions and identities as being crucial in distant past. Arguments in favour of such reconstructions have references to the writings of ancient authors like Polybius and Livy.⁵⁸ Recently, information regarding the Illyrian (proto-)history has been reevaluated. It has been shown that not just modern but also ancient historiographers communicated ways of thinking that were significantly conditioned by their contemporary social and even political circumstances.

According to these new readings of the written sources, so-called Illyrian territory in the last centuries of the 1st millennium BC was inhabited by heterogeneous groups, who displayed various socio-political identities and who were not firmly socially and politically coherent before the final conquest by the Romans.⁵⁹ Within the strategy of the conqueror, future socio-political cohesion of the province to be (Illyricum) was implicitly projected in ancient historiography, using politically coloured descriptions of the eastern Adriatic.⁶⁰ The stance that Iron Age populations in the eastern Adriatic were not socially compact is indirectly supported even with explicit data in the written sources – books of Polybius and Titus Livius, who had mentioned numerous conflicts between neighbouring communities in the wake of the Roman conquest.⁶¹

The complex social relations in the Late Iron Age in the Southeastern Adriatic are also indicated by the existence of fortified settlements as

dominant points in the prehistoric landscapes. The traditional explanation is that these structures are actually traces of towns and marks of urbanisation.⁶² This argument accords with the theory of social evolution, as gradual progress towards “civilised” way of living and a creation of a civilised socio-political structure, a state or a kingdom, along with development of the economy especially trade in the ancient Adriatic. This point is questionable not just in theoretical terms, but also when compared to some specific examples from the ancient past regarding state and city formation.

The so called “Illyrian kingdom” could not be considered a territorial entity;⁶³ or a *rechtsstaat*, if it were compared to the much more developed political structures in antiquity (like ancient Athens as an example).⁶⁴ Nor can many of these settlements be considered as towns, but rather as fortified villages that were glorified in modern historiography and archaeology (for an example, the same conclusion was made regarding many small communities in the Aegean).⁶⁵

In addition, the traditional argument is not consistent with the above mentioned fact that fortified settlements do not represent points in landscapes that were connected but detached from one another.⁶⁶ Communities which supposedly formed compact socio-political groups according to the traditional interpretation, presumably would have been aware of their common ethnic identity, and presumably would belong to the one and the same political entity, in reality obviously perceived themselves as adversaries; being the neighbours separated by high walls and occupying positions difficult to access.

Furthermore, funerary finds in the Southeastern Adriatic from the 4th until the 1st century BC, actually depict quite a contrasting picture to the traditional view. Crucial necropoleis are not just full with various imports, those imports overwhelmingly dominate domestic products.⁶⁷ The traditional response to this fact is that this is a

⁵⁶ Dzino 2008; Kuzmanović / Vranić 2013.

⁵⁷ Kuzmanović / Vranić 2013, 251–252.

⁵⁸ Pol. II; Liv. XLIV.

⁵⁹ Šašel-Kos 2002; 2005; Dzino 2010.

⁶⁰ Dzino 2010.

⁶¹ Pol. II; Liv. XLIV.

⁶² Islami 1972a; 1972d; 1975b; 1975c; Prendi / Zheku 1972; Papajani 1976a; Suić 1976; Karaiskaj 1981; Dyczek et al. 2010; Ceka 1987; 1989; 1990; 1998; 2005.

⁶³ Papazoglu 1988, 187.

⁶⁴ Avramović 1998.

⁶⁵ Bintliff 2006.

⁶⁶ Димитријевић 2015.

⁶⁷ Basler 1969; Anamali 1972; Korkuti 1972b; Karaiskaj 1977–1978; Marković 2012.

matter of Hellenization; a conception of gradual cultural change. This kind of archaeological record would actually suggest that alleged “Illyrian” (domestic or local) cultural norms have not been emphasised through usage of material culture in the last four centuries BC, at least regarding those particular aspects of social life such as sepulchral practice, cult and socioeconomic exchange.

One cannot totally discard the argument that group identification and recognition of the other based on a spoken language or on some other apparent aspect of culture in direct contacts between people could have been occurring in prehistory. But conceptualisation of ethnicity as a crucial collective identity focal point in the Iron Age is a modern construct.⁶⁸ Bearing in mind its political aspect, along with the supposed social extent or geographical range of this or some similar ideas, the traditional model of group identification and recognition could have existed in the distant past, but in reality on much smaller social and spatial scales than it is usually thought to have been the case.

However, along with the intense focus of archaeologists and historians on ethnic identity regarding the “Illyrian” past, some of the researches of central and western Balkan Iron Age and protohistory, identified social hierarchy as well. These identifications implicitly suggested the existence of various class identities in prehistory.

4.2. Modelling socioeconomic identifications in the “Illyrian” society

As mentioned above, the modern perception of collective identities in western and central Balkan late prehistory was inevitably conditioned by evolutionism (ethnogenesis, urbanisation and state formation); or put more precisely, it was influenced by different modern conceptions of evolution of human society and culture coupled with the understanding of cultural changes and the economy in distant past.⁶⁹

The concept of Hellenization of Illyrians is given priority as the explanation of these crucial cultural change seen in the archaeological record. In this (pre)historical context Hellenization was understood as acculturation on the basis of

ancient Greek cultural norms that were diffused from the Aegean and Ionian colonists to the eastern Adriatic coast during the last centuries of the 1st millennium BC.⁷⁰ Cultural change as explained through the diffusionist model was related to the intensified profusion of imports, which supposedly illustrated the process of acculturation. The surplus of imported objects were understood in a formalistic manner;⁷¹ as trade operations between two ethnically compact groups, the Illyrians and the Greeks, intensified in the ancient Adriatic, so the process of Hellenization increased.⁷²

Many of these conclusions were founded on a comparison of data in written sources and archaeological finds in a funerary context. Hence, traditional diffusionist and modernist interpretation, based on particular anthropological and (neoclassical) economic models highlight foreign cultural and economic influence on populations whose collective identity was primarily based on their ethnicity, but was also manifested through economic relations and vertical social diversification. The following names have been used in labelling different class distinctions and identifications in the Balkans during the late prehistory and protohistory. Terms like *Principes* (mentioned in the written sources), “princes”, “tribal aristocracy” and “warrior aristocracy” (defined in archaeological and modern historiographical literature), denote ruling classes in the given social context.⁷³ Ancient authors also named lower classes of the Illyrian society, which have been equally communicated in modern historiography, namely “dependent peasants” (*proselatai*) and “slaves” (*servi*).⁷⁴

Additionally, distinct socio-political and economical formations were identified within the Illyrian society in later periods of their protohistory. In modern historiography these were denoted as the *koine* or smaller alliances within a particular community centred towards a particular big settlement (for an example, the *koine*

⁷⁰ Suić 1976; Čović 1987; Vasić 1987.

⁷¹ On the critical considerations of the formalistic view to economy in the past see: Polanyi 1977, 21–24; Morely 2007.

⁷² Ceka 1972; 1984; 2005; Dautaj 1975; Mano 1975; Prendi 1975a; Čović 1987; Vasić 1987; Papazoglu 1988; Cabanes 1988; Kirigin 1994; Ujes 1999; Katić 2002; Kirigin / Katuranić / Šešelj 2005.

⁷³ Vasić 1987, 650; Papazoglu 1988.

⁷⁴ Papazoglu 1988, 189–190.

⁶⁸ Hansen 2000, 12.

⁶⁹ Cf. Olsen 2002.

of Amantia, the *koine* of Byllis, the community of Dimal, etc.).⁷⁵ This conclusion was also based on comparison of written sources and archaeological records (finds of particular coins, locally produced); and were also founded in formalistic views on the ancient economy and analogies with the contemporary Hellenistic institutions.

Regarding critics of diffusionism and bearing in mind that archaeology developed as a discipline in the context of modern European socio-political conditions, the concept of Hellenization should be seen today as a modern construct that is projected onto the past.⁷⁶ Although the acculturation model originally was conceptualized as a two-way communication and elaboration of cultural influences, in the case of eastern Adriatic late prehistory it was almost exclusively seen as overwhelming one-way Greek influence on Illyrians, and not as both parties' specific cultural response to various socioeconomic contacts.

Conclusions founded on the archaeological evidence for the most part regard the extent of economic and military power along with the degree of Hellenization. These have been based on the measured quantity and quality of archaeological finds found in the funerary context. In other words, it is an evaluation of luxurious and imported objects found within burial places, comprehended through modern values of one's wealth, economic and political power.⁷⁷

However, economic relations in the distant past were of particular importance in archaeological interpretation founded on neo-evolutionary typologies and substantivist conceptions of socioeconomics.⁷⁸ In this respect, explanation of the emergence of great number of imports in the central and western Balkan Iron Age, especially in funerary contexts, was based on a systemic conception of culture and on an application of various socioeconomic models (ideal or artificial displays of society); moreover, archaeological data have been attached to supposed theoretical explanation, in attempt to form objective conclusions.⁷⁹

From substantivists' point of view, the economy in the distant past should not be understood

in terms of primitive market (capitalistic) economic relations, but as part of socioeconomic totality, in which production, exchange and trade of goods were socially conditioned and bonded. In that respect, an interpretation that explains the rich profusion of imports as a mark of developed trade in the given (pre)historical context (often implicitly understood and described in terms of market economy) is therefore too simplistic and consequently erroneous. This changed view has implications for the understanding of vertical social diversification in the given prehistorical context. It has impact on identification of social classes of late prehistory along with comprehension of identities that could have been related to them.

Socioeconomic relations in the central and western Balkan Iron Age were labelled as chiefdoms – institutionalised kin based relations characterised by centralised redistribution of goods by dominant social actors – chiefs.⁸⁰ Chiefs are considered members of the dominant class, and thus could be aligned with a distinct social identity manifested through high social status. This status was founded on their clan relations and position, along with their socioeconomic function. This aspect was principally demonstrated by differences of quality of funerary finds and their functional explication within modelled presumptions.

The inference regarding chiefdoms was derived from the substantivist view of socioeconomics in the distant past – conceptions of goods production, exchange, trade and warfare, chiefly conditioned by social structures in the past.⁸¹ Therefore, the change of theoretical frameworks related to the understanding of the economy in the past also slightly changed the focus of archaeologists with respect to social identifications, from horizontal social diversification to vertical diversification, and from ethno-cultural categorisation of groups to functional explanation that modelled arrangements of socioeconomic structures in prehistory.

Yet, this interpretation does not offer a complete answer. The apparent complexity, fluidity and constant chances for alteration of social

⁷⁵ Anamali 1965; Ceka 1984; Dautaj 1986.

⁷⁶ Бабић 2008.

⁷⁷ Vasić 1987.

⁷⁸ Polanyi 2001; Adams 1974; Service 1975; Polanyi 1977.

⁷⁹ Popović 1987; Palavestra 1993; Babić 2002; Бабић 2004. Compare with: Olsen 2002, 43–55. 81–95. 123–129.

⁸⁰ Babić 2002; Бабић 2004; Compare with: Service 1975, 15–16. 71–102; Polanyi 2001; Earle 1987; Gosden 2002, 91–92.

⁸¹ Polanyi 2001; Adams 1974; Polanyi 1977.

identities in prehistory just cannot be fully captured. Identities in the distant past cannot just be modelled, but rather need to be comprehended through social practices, indicated by the ways of consumption of material culture.

5. Case study: Socioeconomic practices and identities in the Late Iron Age Ošanići

One of the examples of the complex phenomena described above is the archaeological traces of Iron Age settlement located in Ošanići, in the southeastern part of Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁸² The Iron Age settlement was dated between the 8th and 1st century BC, but a drastic change in the archaeological record at the site in terms of architectural elaboration and increased quantities of various imported artefacts occurred from the end of the 4th century BC onward.⁸³ According to written sources and locally produced coins, the population of that area was identified as the Illyrian tribe of Daorsoi, and the complex at Ošanići was identified with the ancient “urban” settlement of Daorson.⁸⁴

This particular ethno-cultural identification has been critically analyzed in terms of research methodology which derived from culture-historical epistemology, and with regard to the specific, intertwined historical and political narratives (ancient and modern) through which it was constructed in historiography and archaeology.⁸⁵ This well founded criticism, derived from the post-structuralist point of view, puts into ques-

tion not just “Illyrian” identity of the Daorsoi, but their tribal identification.⁸⁶

5.1. Archaeological overview of the Late Iron Age settlement at Ošanići

Ošanići is situated in a rough and fragmented landscape, in a hilly and karstic area, called Humine. The fortified Iron Age settlement was the largest in this area by far; it was surrounded with contemporaneous, also fortified, but smaller settlements, like those in Borojevići, Brštanik, Dragovija, Prenj, Čapljina, Vid, and many others.⁸⁷ The settlement is situated on the Gradina Hilltop and on the Banje Plateau; it is elevated above the Vidovo Plain and the Bregava River, a tributary of the Neretva River, the river valley of which connects the Adriatic Coast and its hinterland.⁸⁸

A necropolis, in which two graves were excavated, was found to the east of the settlement.⁸⁹ The settlement covers at least 20 ha, and it was gradually enlarged during its existence.⁹⁰ The fortified part of the settlement occupies the hill top and southern / western slopes, and encloses remains of houses, a cistern, cult structures and streets, the directions of which were adjusted to the terrain morphology.⁹¹

The main fortification structure positioned between two parts of the settlement, the “Hellenistic” wall dated between ca. 300 to the 2nd century BC, was gradually constructed; the main gate, rectangular towers, second gate were added, and both gates were finally made smaller.⁹² The unfortified part extends over the plateau eastward; it comprises remains of cisterns, buildings and large enclosures, and is connected with streets, the main ones of which have irregular radial ori-

⁸² Basler 1956; 1971; Marić 1967; 1969; 1970; 1971; 1972; 1973a; 1973b; 1973c; 1973d; 1975; 1976a; 1976b; 1976c; 1976d; 1977; 1979; 1992–1997; 2000; 2004; 2006; Marijanović 1984; Marijan 1991; 2011; Marić / Forić 2005.

⁸³ Marić 1977, 38; Traces of an earlier prehistoric settlement in Ošanići are dated in the Bronze Age. The destruction of Late Iron Age settlement is dated around year 50 BC, and it was related to the local conflicts between Daorsoi and Delmatae. After the final Roman conquest of the region, from the end of the 1st century BC onward there was just a small military station within ruins of the settlement. On this matter see: Marić 1973b, 237–238; 1976a; 1976d, 247; 1977, 38; Marijanović 1984, 17–18. 21–22; Marijan 1991, 103–104; 2011.

⁸⁴ Basler 1971; Marić 1973c; 1975; 1976a; 1976d; 1977; 1979; 1992–1997; 2004; 2006; Marić / Forić 2005.

⁸⁵ Džino 2007.

⁸⁶ Ibid.; see also: Džino 2006; 2008.

⁸⁷ Marić 1975; 1985; 2000; Basler 1988; Marijan 1988; 1989; Kirigin 1994; Kirigin et al. 2005, 24; Šalov 2010, 359–360. Marić identified close to 60 Iron Age settlements in the territory of so called Daorsoi, dispersed over a large hilly area of Humine, around river of Neretva and its tributaries; see: Marić 1975, Map 1.

⁸⁸ Basler 1956.

⁸⁹ Marić 1973a; Marijan 2011, 183.

⁹⁰ Marijan 2011.

⁹¹ Basler 1956; Marić 1977; Marijanović 1984; Šašel-Kos 2005, Fig. 86; Marijan 2011, 179–182; Fig. 2. 3. 5. 6.

⁹² Marijan 1991, 103–104.

entation and meet on an open space called “Agora” in front of the main gate.⁹³

The most numerous finds from the settlement are imported amphorae. Several thousands of fragments were found, dating between the 6th and 1st century BC, but most come from the 4th to the 2nd century BC and include Greco-Italic, Corinthian B, Pharos 2, Lamboglia 2 types, as well as some East Mediterranean and other types.⁹⁴ Many fragments had scratched graffiti using writing from various alphabets (e.g., Latin, Greek, Etruscan, Umbrian, Phoenician), probably denoting the primary owners of transported products (wine and olive oil) or numerical signs.⁹⁵ One of them has the name *Daorsoi* inscribed.⁹⁶

Fine pottery finds include predominantly Gnathian vessels, mostly skyphoi and oenochorai, imported from Southern Italy and Vis;⁹⁷ many of these vessels’ fragments were found within the settlement, but excavated graves also contained imported skyphoi, unguentaria and fragments of other pots.⁹⁸

Around 60 bronze and silver coins of different origins were found at Ošanići, dating between the 5th and the 2nd century BC; except for a few coins which were excavated near the main gate in a destruction layer, almost all were found in the settlement close to its highest point and inside houses.⁹⁹ Locally minted coins can be dated to the 2nd century BC; they were made of bronze, on one side with an image of a man (possibly the ruler) wearing a hat (*petasos* or *kausia*), and on the other a ship (*lembos*) as well as the name Daorson (ΔΑΟΡΣΩΝ in Greek).¹⁰⁰ So far, 11 pieces from different minting series are known.¹⁰¹ Imported coins include 28 pieces of King Bal-

aios (the 2nd century BC), and pieces of Roman Republican coins, as well as coins of Anactorio, Corinth, Dyrrachium, Pharos, Phocis (mostly dating between the 4th and the 2nd century BC).¹⁰²

Finds of weapons are known from different archaeological contexts. Iron spears were found within the settlement in destruction layers, and one piece in a grave of a man; almost all of them dated to the last four centuries BC, but they are different in origin; the so-called Illyrian pieces have parallels with finds in Montenegro and Albania, one piece has analogies with finds from northern Bosnia, and one is of La Tène (“Celtic”) type.¹⁰³ Several arrowheads were found in the settlement; one was described as “Greek”.¹⁰⁴ Two iron knives were found, and both in the grave of a woman.¹⁰⁵ One iron sword was found in the settlement.¹⁰⁶

Uncovered fragments of bronze helmets belong to the so-called Illyrian type were found, dating to the 4th/3rd century BC; a fragment of one of them was found in the fortified part of the settlement,¹⁰⁷ while the second one was excavated in front of the main gate in the destruction layer.¹⁰⁸ It was damaged and signed with three letters PIN (ΠΙΝ, in Greek), which is an abbreviation for the personal name Pinnes.¹⁰⁹ Finds of jewelry at Ošanići are known both from the settlement and necropolis. They are mostly dated between the 5th and the 1st century BC, and include local products, like bronze buttons and double pins; but imported objects predominate: La Tène fibulae, imported double pins, one golden plate with woman’s image, three bronze belt plates, and some other Mediterranean imports.¹¹⁰ The previously mentioned grave of a woman also contained a golden ring with semi-transparent stone of Italic origin, a silver omega pin, three La

⁹³ Basler 1956; Marijan 2011, 182–183 Fig. 2. 7.

⁹⁴ Marić 1967; 1973a, 182; 1977, 40–41; Fig. 2. 3. 4; Pl. 32, 1. 4. 6. 11; Pl. 33, 2. 4. 5; 2000, 42; 2004, 194; 2006, 133; Marijan 1991; Kirigin 1994, 18; Katić 1999–2000, 49–51; 2001–2002, 52. 56.

⁹⁵ Marić 2004, 187–192; 2006, 127–133; Marić / Forić 2005, 185–188.

⁹⁶ Marić / Forić 2005, 182.

⁹⁷ Marić 1973a, 179–182; Pl. 13, 7; Pl. 16, 3; Pl. 21, 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6; Pl. 22, 1. 3. 4. 7; 1976a; 1977, 43; 2000, 42; 2006, 126.

⁹⁸ Marić 1973a, 175–176. 184; Pl. 4; Pl. 13; Pl. 15.

⁹⁹ Marić 1967; 1969; 1970; 1971; 1972; 1973b; 1976c; 1977; 2000;

¹⁰⁰ Rendić-Miočević 1965; Marić 1973b, 237; 2000, 44; Kozličić 1981; Popović 1987, 124–125.

¹⁰¹ Džino 2007, 71; compare with: Kozličić 1981; Marić 2000.

¹⁰² Marić 1967, 40; 1969, 78; 1970, 40; 1971, 34–35; Pl. 20; Pl. 21; 1972, 41; 1973b, 237–250; Pl. 1; Pl. 2; Pl. 3; Pl. 4; 1977, 48; 2000, 44; Vasilj 1992; 2003.

¹⁰³ Marić 1973a, Pl. 15; 1977, 46–47; Pl. 27, 1. 2; Pl. 28, 8. 9. 10. 14.

¹⁰⁴ Marić 1973a, Pl. 15; 1977, 46–47; Pl. 27, 1. 2; Pl. 28, 8. 9. 10. 14.

¹⁰⁵ Marić 1970, 39; Marić 1973a, 182, Pl. 14, 12.

¹⁰⁶ Marić 1970, 39.

¹⁰⁷ Marić 1973a, 179; Pl. 15, 10.

¹⁰⁸ Marić 1969, 78.

¹⁰⁹ Marić 1977, 48; Pl. 26, 48.

¹¹⁰ Marić 1967, 39; 1971, 35; Pl. 19; 1973a, 175; Pl. 13; Pl. 4; 1973d, 257, Pl. 1; Pl. 2; 1972, 41; 1976a, 48, 54; Pl. 29, 13; 1977, 47; 48; Pl. 29, 4. 17. 18. 49.

Tène fibulae, a part of an earring (a small “negroid” head) of the South Italic origin.¹¹¹

A significant find from Ošanići is the tools’ depot found in one of the houses of the 2nd century BC; it contained 245 objects including agricultural, metalworking and woodworking tools, as well as casts and semi-finished products of jewelry.¹¹² Tool finds in the settlement also include bronze fishing hooks and sewing needles.¹¹³

5.2. “Daorson” and “Daorsoi”

The above reviewed archaeological material from Ošanići points to some of the crucial socio-economic practices and consequently to various socioeconomic and cultural identifications in the past. Practices of warfare and habitation within a fortified and self-sufficient settlement which possessed the ability to defend itself (mutual defence) and produce basic goods, are strongly suggested by the evidence.

The settlement at Ošanići was surrounded by other settlements in the landscape with numerous local settings.¹¹⁴ All the settlements here were fortified,¹¹⁵ but they were not connected and not oriented towards mutual line of defence. These facts demonstrate that their inhabitants primarily defended themselves locally (individually).¹¹⁶

Consequently, those communities must have been self-sufficient. This is indicated not just through topography analysis, which shows that each settlement controlled particular local resources, but also with finds of various tools. Even the biggest settlement could not rely on importing basic goods, but had to produce them. All these notions influenced ideas of various local identities within the area.

Tools found exclusively within the settlement had no particular significance for recognition of social positions and rank, and their usage was

widespread with exception of specialized metalwork production. Finds of weapons and their contexts additionally suggest that warfare was a widespread practice. Warrior attributes and looks emphasized in personal appearance, using objects of different origins was not exclusively related to some local (“Illyrian”) identification, but personalised and even marked with personal signatures (the helmet of *Pinnes*).

Personalized appearance was accessorised with jewellery and clothing parts of various origins, suggesting layered cultural apprehensions and the various status of people. This aspect is illustrated especially by the grave of a woman, which contained locally produced knives, but imported jewellery of various origins and vessels for wine consummation. Personal identifications were to a significant degree communicated through material and even written reinterpretation of predominantly imported values, consumed through socioeconomic interactions.

A part of these interactions was the redistribution of goods and objects. This is strongly suggested by the distribution patterns of amphorae and fine pottery at Ošanići and its neighboring settlements.¹¹⁷ These vessels were present in largest quantities at Ošanići, but in much smaller quantities at other places, despite some of them being much closer to the respective centers of production.¹¹⁸ This suggests that Late Iron Age settlement at Ošanići was one of the centers for redistribution of wine and olive oil, as well as for fine pottery used in wine consumption.¹¹⁹ This

¹¹¹ Marić 1972, 41; Marić 1973a, 175; Pl. 4. 13.

¹¹² Marić 1979.

¹¹³ Marić 1970, 39; Marić 1977, 46; Pl. 28, 14.

¹¹⁴ Borojevići, Brštanik, Dragovija, Prenj, Čapljina, Vid, etc. See: Marić 1975.

¹¹⁵ Marić 1975; 1985; Basler 1988; Marijan 1988; 1989.

¹¹⁶ This kind of locally conceptualised defence in the eastern Adriatic in the wake of the Roman conquest is actually suggested in written sources, in books of Polybius and Livy; not only that defence was not coordinated between different communities who have found themselves threaten by the Romans, they actually were often confronted by one another; see: Pol. II; Liv. XLIV.

¹¹⁷ Those other settlements were located in Borojevići, Brštanik, Dragovija, Prenj, Čapljina, Vid, etc. Amphorae and fine potteries overwhelmingly covered the settlement in Ošanići. Domestic pottery made by hand, the so called “Illyrian” pottery, was present up to only 10 to 20 percent; see: Marić 1976d, 247.

¹¹⁸ For Ošanići see: Marić 1967; 1973a, 179–182; Pl. 13, 7; Pl. 16, 3; Pl. 21, 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6; Pl. 22, 1. 3. 4. 7; 1976a; 1977, 40–41. 43; Fig. 2. 3. 4; Pl. 32, 1. 4. 6. 11; Pl. 33, 2. 4. 5; 2000, 42; 2004, 194; 2006, 126. 133; Marijan 1991; Kirigin 1994, 18; Katić 1999–2000, 49–51; 2001–2002, 52. 56; for other settlements see: Marić 1985, 51; 2000, 39; Basler 1988, 183; Marijan 1989, 66, Pl. 2, 4. 5. 6. 7; 2001, 96; Fig. 16; Kirigin 1994, 18. 20.

¹¹⁹ One could infer that this kind of distribution pattern of amphorae and fine pottery actually indicates that smaller settlements needed less wine and olive oil. However, this does not explain why a particular settlement became a redistribution center with the location far away from the production centers; and some other settlements did not become the centers for redistribution and stayed small, even

network of socioeconomic exchange must have been one of focal points for social recognition in the past, which consequently influenced the idea of collective identity of a particular group of socioeconomic actors, centralised through redistribution practice at the settlement found in Ošanići.

The finds of various coins at Ošanići and in neighbouring settlements suggest their inhabitants' involvements in various and coexisting exchange networks. Locally produced coins indicate that one of these networks was centralized at Ošanići "Daorson", organised by the settlement's elite who signed the coins, and/or the ruler depicted in these objects, suggesting his high social status and strong personal, local and probably also regional identity reproduced through socioeconomic practice.

Redistribution in "Daorson" is even suggested with Ošanići settlement plan. Open space of the "Agora" where radially positioned streets meet, directed the movements of incomers coming from beyond the great wall, which protected the locals. This indicates a specifically structurized (centralized) space; the place of redistribution.

Hence, it is noteworthy to pose the question whether Daorson could be perceived as a socioeconomic network which was repeatedly reproduced through exchange practices, rather than an ethnic group; and whether this group was centralized through those practices directed at the particular place for exchange, Daorson, which is identified (stamped) through the medium (coins) used in the exchange practices?

6. Concluding Thoughts

By all appearances, individual and group, social and cultural identities in the past communities were constantly constructed and reconstructed in various ways through social practices, which involved communication of miscellaneous meanings associated with the routines of consumption of different objects and goods. These objects were predominantly various imports, exchanged through socioeconomic relations.

In the Late Iron Age communities in the Southeastern Adriatic and its hinterland, various

though they were closer to that production center and in position to be mediators between different communities.

social and cultural identities were significantly embedded in socioeconomic relations, considerably reproduced through practices of warfare, habitation and socioeconomic exchange, primarily redistribution and distribution of goods and objects. These practices conditioned awareness of particular groups and communities regarding their common identities embedded in these (socioeconomic) interactions, and overlapped in their comprehensions, recursively articulated through their actions (practices).

The view presented here cannot deny the existence of ethnic identifications of people in the late prehistory. Some form of ethnic distinctions must have existed in this social context, namely based on usage of spoken language in the past. But such identifications are not clearly documented in the archaeological records, nor did they significantly influence socioeconomic relations, which are strikingly evident in archaeological traces. Surely, those identifications could not have been perceived equally in the distant past as they are in the modern era.

However, kin based relations as well as cult practices must have been of great importance for collective identifications. This was confirmed with existence of group burials and consummation of wine in the documented funerary practices.¹²⁰

Archaeological materials taken into consideration and changed theoretical perspective to approaching identities in the past, imply contrasting view to the traditional one. I would like to point that the ideas of collective identities in the given social context in the past were considerably (re)produced through socioeconomic practices and relations.

Na engleski jezik preveo autor

¹²⁰ Basler 1969; Marković 2012.

Rezime

Socioekonomski odnosi i identiteti u gvozdenom dobu Jugoistočnog Jadrana

U fokusu rada je povezanost socioekonomskih odnosa i grupnih identiteta društvenih zajednica mlađeg gvozdenog doba sa prostora jugoistočnog Jadrana i bliskog primorskog zaleđa. Osnovni cilj rada je da se ukaže na različita razumevanja i percepcije kolektivnih identiteta u dalekoj prošlosti, suprotno uobičajenom razumevanju u čijem fokusu je etnicitet kao ključni izraz grupnih identiteta u mlađem gvozdenom dobu jugoistočnog Jadrana. Interpretacija počiva na konstruktivističkom razumevanju kulture i novoj evaluaciji date arheološke građe koja je presudno određena prisustvom importa, što bitno ističe socioekonomske odnose iz daleke prošlosti.

Utvrđivanjem povezanosti arheoloških podataka i predložene teorijske postavke, upućuje se na zaključak da je razumevanje grupnih identiteta u datom društvenom kontekstu u prošlosti bilo u presudnoj meri ukorenjeno u socioekonomskim odnosima. Takva shvatanja grupnih identiteta u dalekoj prošlosti su delimično reprodukovana kroz različite društvene prakse, uključujući i korišćenje materijalne kulture. Zaključuje se da su reprodukcija i razumevanje grupnih identiteta u mlađem gvozdenom dobu jugoistočnog Jadrana bitno određeni socioekonomskim interakcijama kroz ratovanje, stanovanje u utvrđenim naseljima i socioekonomsku razmenu.

Bibliography

- Adams, R. 1974, Anthropological Perspectives on Ancient Trade, *Current Anthropology* 15, 1974, 239–258.
- Anamali, S. 1965, Le stade d'Amantie, *Studia Albanica* 2, 1965, 59–64.
- Anamali, S. 1972, Amantie, *L'Illyrie* 2, 1972, 67–148.
- Anamali, S. / Korkuti, M. 1970, Les Illyriens et la gènes des Albanais à la lumière des recherches archéologiques albanaises, *Studia Albanica* 7, 1970, 123–155.
- Ashmore, M. 1989, The Reflexive thesis. Writing Sociology of scientific knowledge, Chicago, London 1989.
- Avramović, S. 1998, Elementi pravne države i individualna prava u Atini, In: Avramović, S. (ed.), Prav-

na država u antici, pro et contra, Beograd, 1998, 7–41.

- Babić, S. 2002, "Princely Graves" of the Central Balkans – a Critical History of Research. *European Journal of Archaeology* 5, 2002, 70–88.
- Бабић, С. 2004, Поглаварство и полис. Старије гвоздено доба централног Балкана и грчки свет, Београд 2004.
- Бабић, С. 2008, Грци и други. Античка перцепција и перцепција антике, Београд 2008.
- Babić, S. 2010, Arheologija i etnicitet. Етноантрополошки проблеми н. с. год. 5 св. 1, 2010, 137–149.
- Barth, F. 1969, Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social organization of culture difference, Oslo 1969.
- Basler, Đ. 1956, Gradina na Ošanićima kod Stoca. Neki noviji rezultati istraživačkih Radova, Naše starine. Godišnjak Zemaljskog zavoda za zaštitu spomenika kulture i prirodnih rijetkosti Narodne Republike Bosne i Hercegovine 3, 1956, 79–94.
- Basler, Đ. 1969, Nekropola na Velim Ledinama u Gostilju (Donja Zeta), *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* 24, 1969, 5–107.
- Basler, Đ. 1971, Novčić plemena Daorsa, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* 26, 1971, 333–336.
- Basler, Đ. 1988, Konštica 1, In: Čović, B. (ed.), *Arheološki leksikon BiH tom 3*, Sarajevo 1988.
- Batović, Š. 1988, Konavle u prapovijesti, *Konavoski zbornik* 2, 1988, 13–148.
- Benac, A. 1972, Aport à l'étude des processus ethnogénétiques et à la délimitation territoriale des tribus illyriennes, *Studia Albanica* 9, 1972, 173–185.
- Benac, A. 1987, O etničkim zajednicama starijeg gvozdenog doba u Jugoslaviji, In: Benac A. (ed.), *Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja 5, željezno doba*, Sarajevo 1987, 737–802.
- Berger, P. / Luckmann, T. 1991, The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, London 1991.
- Bintliff, J. 2006, City – Country Relationships in the "Normal Polis", In: Rosen, R. / Sluiter, I., *City, Countryside and Spatial Organisation of Value in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden, Boston 2006, 13–32.
- Bojanovski, I. 1985, Ilirska plemena u istočnoj Hercegovini i njihov smještaj, *Tribunia* 9, 1985, 7–23.
- Bourdieu, P. 1985, Social Space and Genesis of Groups, *Theory and Society* 14, 1985, 723–744.
- Bourdieu, P. 1989, Social Space and Symbolic Power, *Sociological Theory* 7, 1989, 14–25.
- Bourdieu, P. 1995, Outline of a Theory of Practice, Cambridge 1995.
- Cabanes, P. 1988, Les Illyriens de Bardylis à Genthios, IVe–IIe siècles avant J.–C., Paris 1988.
- Ceka, N. 1972, Questions de numismatique illyrienne, Tirana 1972.
- Ceka, N. 1984, Koinoni i bilinëve, *Iliria* 14, 1984, 61–89.

- Ceka, N. 1986, Amfora antike nga Margëlliçi, Iliria 16, 1986, 71–98.
- Ceka, N. 1987, Arkitektura e qytezës ilir të Margëlliçit, Monumentet 33, 1987, 5–25.
- Ceka, N. 1989, Bylis, Iliria 19, 1989, 274–276.
- Ceka, N. 1990, Bylis, Iliria 21, 1990, 261–262.
- Ceka, N. 1998, Fifty Years of Studies on Illyrian Cities, Iliria 28, 1998, 127–128.
- Ceka, N. 2005, The Illyrians to the Albanians, Tirana 2005.
- Čović, B. 1987, Glasinačka kultura, In: Benac, A. (ed.), Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja 5, željezno doba, Sarajevo 1987, 575–643.
- Čović, B. 1991, Die Bronzezeit im “illyrischen” Raum und das Problem der ethnischen Zuschreibung archäologischer Funde, In: Benac, A. / Garašanin, M. / Čović, B. / Tasić, N. / Alirejsović, E. (eds.), Tribus paléobalkaniques entre la mer Adriatique et la mer Noire de l’énéolithique jusqu’à l’époque hellénistique, Premier symposium illyro-thrace, Niš – Blagoevgrad, 30 mai au 4 juin 1989, Académie des sciences et des arts de Bosnie et Herzégovine, Publication spéciale 94, Centre d’études balkaniques, livre 14; Académie Serbe des sciences et des arts, Institut des études balkaniques, Publication spéciale 45, Sarajevo, Beograd 1991, 57–72.
- Dautaj, B. 1972, La cité illyrienne de Dimale, L’Illyrie 2, 1972, 149–165.
- Dautaj, B. 1975, Aspects de la vie économique à Dimale, In: Benac, A. (ed.), Agglomération fortifiée illyrienne, Colloque international à Mostar, 24 octobre au 26 octobre 1974, Académie des sciences et des arts de Bosnie et Herzégovine, Publication spéciale 24, Centre d’études balkaniques, livre 6, Sarajevo 1975, 189–200.
- Dautaj, B. 1976, Dimale à la lumière des données archéologiques, Iliria 4, 1976, 385–409.
- Dautaj, B. 1986, Organizimi politik e shoqëror i bashkësisë dimalite në shek. III–II p. e. sonë, Iliria 16, 1986, 101–111.
- Димитријевић, М. 2015, Прилог познавања хеленистичке фортификације на југоисточном Јадрану, Војноисторијски гласник 1, 2015, 185–206.
- Dornan, J. 2002, Agency and Archaeology: Past, Present and Future Directions, Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 9, 2002, 303–329.
- Dyczek, P. 2010, Preliminary remarks on the archaeological context of the discovery of the “great hoard” of 4656 coins of King Ballaios in Risan (Rhizon/Risinium), Novensia 21, 2010, 45–50.
- Dyczek, P. / Kowacevic, V. / Lutovac, P. / Martinovic, J. / Reclaw, J. / Stankovic, A. 2004, Rhizon, 2001–2003, Preliminary Report on the Excavations of the Center for Archaeological Research – Novae, Warsaw University, Archeologia 55, 2004, 101–118.
- Dyczek, P. / Kowacevic, V. / Lemke, M. / Lutovac, P. / Reclaw, J. 2007, Rhizon 2004–2007, Preliminary Report on the Excavations of the Center for Archaeological Research – Novae, Warsaw University, Archeologia 58, 2007, 101–118.
- Dyczek, P. / Kolendo, J. / Łajtar, A. / Plocennik, T. / Rzepkowski, K. 2010, Iliryski bóg Medaurus i mury Risinium w świetle inskrypcji metrycznej z Lambaesis (CIL VIII 2581; F. Buecheler, Carmina Latina epigraphica 1527), Novensia 21, 2010, 79–134.
- Džino, D. 2006, Dalmati, vino i formiranje etničkog identiteta u predrimskom Iliriku, Vijesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku 99, 2006, 71–80.
- Džino, D. 2007, Daorsi i “Daorsi”: o metanarativima i paralelnim narativima prošlosti, Život. Časopis za književnost i kulturu 55 (3), 2007, 63–74.
- Džino, D. 2008, Deconstructing ‘Illyrians’. Zeitgeist Changing Perceptions and The Identity of Peoples from Ancient Illyricum, Croatian Studies Review 5, 2008, 43–55.
- Džino, D. 2010, Illyricum in Roman Politics 229 BC–AD 68, Cambridge 2010.
- Earle, T. 1987, Chiefdoms in Archaeological and Ethnohistorical Perspectives, Annual Review of Anthropology 16, 1987, 279–308.
- Eco, U. 1976, A Theory of Semiotics, Bloomington, London 1976.
- Finley, M. 1973, The Ancient Economy, Berkeley, Los Angeles 1973.
- Garašanin, M. 1988, Formation et origines des Illyriens, In: Garašanin, M. (ed.), Les Illyriens et les Albanais, Série de conférences tenues du 21 mai au 4 juin 1986, Académie Serbe des sciences et des arts, Colloques scientifiques 39, Classe de Sciences historiques 10, Beograd 1988, 81–144.
- Georgiev, V. 1972, Les Illyriens et leurs voisins, Studia Albanica 9, 1972, 235–239.
- Giddens, A. 1984, The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration, Berkeley, Los Angeles 1984.
- Gosden, C. 2002, Anthropology and Archaeology. A Changing Relationship, London, New York 2002.
- Gosden, C. 2005, What Do Objects Want?, Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 12, 2005, 193–211.
- Hansen, M. 2000, Introduction. The Concepts of City – State and City – State Culture, In: Hansen, M. (ed.), A Comparative Study of Thrity City – State Cultures: An Investigation, Comparative Study of Thrity City – State Cultures, 5–9th January 1999, Volume 21 of Historisk-filosofiske skrifter, Copenhagen 2000, 11–34.
- Hodder, I. 1985, Postprocessual Archaeology, Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory 8, 1985, 1–26.

- Hodder, I. / Hutson, S. 2003, Reading the past. Current approaches to interpretation in archaeology, Cambridge 2003.
- Islami, S. 1966, Le monnayage de Skodra, Lissos et Genthios, *Studia Albanica* 3, 1966, 225–253.
- Islami, S. 1972a, La ville illyrienne à Zgërdhesh de Kruje, *L'Illyrie* 2, 1972, 217–237.
- Islami, S. 1972b, Le monnayage de Skodra, Lissos et Genthios, *L'Illyrie* 2, 1972, 379–408.
- Islami, S. 1972c, L'Etat illyrien, sa place et son rôle dans le monde méditerranéen, *Studia Albanica* 9, 1972, 77–103.
- Islami, S. 1972d, Naissance et développement de la vie urbaine en Illyrie, *L'Illyrie* 2, 1972, 7–23.
- Islami, S. 1975a, L'Etat illyrien et ses guerres contre Rome, *Iliria* 3, 1975, 5–48.
- Islami, S. 1975b, Zgërdhesh (Krujë), *Iliria* 3, 1975, 425–432.
- Islami, S. 1975c, Problèmes de chronologie de la cité illyrienne, In: Benac, A. (ed.), Agglomération fortifiée illyriens, Colloque international à Mostar, 24 octobre au 26 octobre 1974, Académie des sciences et des arts de Bosnie et Herzégovine, Publication spéciale 24, Centre d'études balkaniques, livre 6, Sarajevo 1975, 37–46.
- Islami, S. 1976, L'Etat illyrien, sa place et son rôle dans le monde méditerranéen, *Iliria* 4, 1976, 71–87.
- Jones, S. 1997, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity. Constructing Identities in Past and Present*, London, New York 1997.
- Jones, A. 2002, *Archaeological Theory and Scientific Practice*, Cambridge 2002.
- Katić, M. 1999–2000, Uvod u proučavanje keramičkih radionica Farosa, *Opuscula archaeologica* 23–24, 1999–2000, 49–58.
- Katić, M. 2001–2002, Proizvodnja korintskih B amfora u Farosu, *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 39, 2001–2002, 51–59.
- Katić, M. 2002, Greeks and the hinterland of Western Balkans, In: Cambi N. (ed.), *Grčki utjecaj na istočnoj obali Jadrana*, *Grčki utjecaj na istočnoj obali Jadrana*, Split 24.–26. rujan 1998, Split 2002, 423–433.
- Karaiskaj, Gj. 1977–1978, Një varrezë e shek. III–IV në qytetin ilir të Zgërdhëshit, *Iliria* 7–8, 1977–1978, 201–216.
- Karaiskaj, Gj. 1981, *Pesë mijë vjet fortifikime në Shqipëri*, Tiranë 1981.
- Kirigin, B. 1994, Grčko-italske amfore na Jadranu, *Arheološki vestnik* 45, 1994, 15–24.
- Kirigin, B. / Katunić, T. / Šešelj, L. 2005, Amfore i fina keramika (od 4. do 1. st. Pr. Kr.) iz srednje Dalmacije – preliminarni ekonomski i socijalni pokazatelji, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest Dalmatinsku* Vol. 1, No. 98, 2005, 7–24.
- Korkuti, M. 1971, Fouilles archéologiques 1967–1969 en Albanie, *Studia Albanica* 8, 1971, 129–160.
- Korkuti, M. 1972a, A propos de la formation de l'ethnie illyrienne, *Studia Albanica* 9, 1972, 55–76.
- Korkuti, M. 1972b, La nécropole de Gajtan, *L'Illyrie* 2, 1972, 451–466.
- Korkuti, M. 1976, De la formation de l'ethnie illyrienne, *Iliria* 4, 1976, 57–70.
- Kozličić, M. 1981, Prikazi brodova na novcu plemena Daorsa, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* n. s. 35–36, 1981, 163–188.
- Kuzmanović, Z. / Vranić, I. 2013, On the reflexive nature of archaeologies of Western Balkan Iron Age. A Case study of Illyrian argument, *Anthropologie* 51, 2013, 249–259.
- Mano, A. 1975, Le commerce et les atères commerciales en Illyrie du Sud, In: Benac A. (ed.), *Agglomération fortifiée illyriens*, Colloque international à Mostar, 24 octobre au 26 octobre 1974, Académie des sciences et des arts de Bosnie et Herzégovine, Publication spéciale 24, Centre d'études balkaniques, livre 6, Sarajevo 1975, 165–174.
- Marić, Z. 1967, Gradina u Ošanićima kod Stoca – ilirsko utvrđenje, *Arheološki pregled* 9, 1967, 39–40.
- Marić, Z. 1969, Gradina, Ošanići, Stolac – ilirsko utvrđenje, *Arheološki pregled* 11, 1969, 77–79.
- Marić, Z. 1970, Ošanići, Stolac – ilirsko gradinsko utvrđenje, *Arheološki pregled* 12, 1970, 36–41.
- Marić, Z. 1971, Gradina u Ošanićima kod Stoca, *Arheološki pregled* 13, 1971, 31–35.
- Marić, Z. 1972, Gradina, Ošanić, Stolac – praistorijska gradina, *Arheološki pregled* 14, 1972, 40–41.
- Marić, Z. 1973a, Arheološka istraživanja na gradini u Ošanićima kod Stoca 1963. Godine, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* 27–28, 1973, 173–235.
- Marić, Z. 1973b, Novčići trećeg i drugog stoljeća stare ere sa gradine u Ošanićima kod Stoca, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* 27–28, 1973, 237–255.
- Marić, Z. 1973c, Daorsoi, Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine 10, 1973, 109–138.
- Marić, Z. 1973d, Ornamentirane pojasne ploče sa gradine u Ošanićima kod Stoca, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* n. s. 27–28, 1973, 257–260.
- Marić, Z. 1975, Praistorijska i protohistorijska utvrđenja na području Daorsa, In: Benac, A. (ed.), *Agglomération fortifiée illyriens*, Colloque international à Mostar, 24 octobre au 26 octobre 1974, Académie des sciences et des arts de Bosnie et Herzégovine, Publication spéciale 24, Centre d'études balkaniques, livre 6, Sarajevo 1975, 103–112.
- Marić, Z. 1976a, Daorsoi (?) na Gradini u Ošanićima kod Stoca – Ilirski grad, *Arheološki pregled* 18, 1976, 55–51.

- Marić, Z. 1976b, Dva nova primjerka daorsijskog novca sa gradine Ošanići kod Stoca, *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine* 13, 1976, 253–260.
- Marić, Z. 1976c, Novootkrivena obloga pojasne ploče sa Gradine u Ošanićima kod Stoca, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* n. s. 29, 1976, 35–40.
- Marić, Z. 1976d, Ošanići – centar Daorsa – kulturno-historijske značajke, In: Suić, M. (ed.), *Jadranska obala u protohistoriji, kulturni i etnički problem*, Dubrovnik 19–23. oktobra 1972, Centar za povijesne znanosti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu i Arheološki institute, Zagreb 1976, 247–254.
- Marić, Z. 1977, Arheološka istraživanja akropole ilirskog grada Daorsa na gradini u Ošanićima kod Stoca od 1967. do 1972. Godine, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* 30–31, 1977, 5–99.
- Marić, Z. 1979, Depo pronađen u ilirskom gradu Daorsa. (2. st. pr. n. e.), *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* 33, 1979, 23–113.
- Marić, Z. 1980, Helenizam i helenistička umjetnost u Hercegovini, In: Tasić N. (ed.), *Sahranjivanje pokojnika sa aspekta ekonomskih i društvenih kretanja u praistoriji i antici*, Materijali 20, Mostar/Beograd 1980, 47–53.
- Marić, Z. 1992–1997, Unutrašnja vrata akropole ilirskog grada Daorsona (Ošanići, Stolac), *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine* 30, 1992–1997, 79–95.
- Marić, Z. 2000, Helenistički uticaji na ilirsko pleme Daorse, *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine* 31, 2000, 37–52.
- Marić, Z. 2004, Grafiti sa grčkih posuda iz razorenog ilirskog grada Daorsona iznad sela Ošanića kod Stoca u Hercegovini, *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine* 33, 2004, 185–216.
- Marić, Z. 2006, Grafiti sa grčkih posuda iz razorenog ilirskog grada Daorsona iznad sela Ošanića kod Stoca u Hercegovini, dio III, *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine* 35, 2006, 125–144.
- Marić, Z. / Forić, M. 2005, Grafiti sa grčkih posuda iz razorenog ilirskog grada Daorsona iznad sela Ošanića kod Stoca u Hercegovini, dio II, *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine* 34, 2005, 181–198.
- Marijan, B. 1988, Konštica 2, In: Čović, B. (ed.), *Arheološki leksikon BiH*, tom 3, Sarajevo 1988, 183.
- Marijan, B. 1989, Protohistorijski nalazi s gradine u Prenju kod Stoca, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* n. s. 42–43, 1989, 61–71.
- Marijan, B. 1991, Sjeveroistočna vrata u megalitskom zidu na Gradini u Ošanićima kod Stoca, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* n. s. 46, 1991, 87–112.
- Marijan, B. 2011, Gradina u Ošanićima – transformacija prapovijesnoga gradinskog u urbano naselje. *Histria Antiqua* 20, 2011, 177–187.
- Marijanović, B. 1984, Završna istraživanja akropole na gradini u Ošanićima, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja – arheologija* n. s. 39, 1984, 11–22.
- Marković, Č. 2012, Antička Budva – Nekropole, istraživanja 1980–1981, Podgorica 2012.
- Meskel, L. 2012, *Archaeologies of Identity*, In: Hodder, I. (ed.), *Archaeological Theory Today*, Cambridge 2012, 187–213.
- Mirdita, Z. 1991, Encore une fois sur le problème d'éthnogenèse des Dardaniens, In: Benac, A. / Garašanin, M. / Čović, B. / Tasić, N. / Alirejsović, E. (eds.), *Tribus paléobalkaniques entre la mer Adriatique et la mer Noire de l'énéolithique jusqu'à l'époque hellénistique*, Premier symposium illyro-thrace, Niš – Blagoevgrad, 30 mai au 4 juin 1989, Académie des sciences et des arts de Bosnie et Herzégovine, Publication spéciale 94, Centre d'études balkaniques, livre 14; Académie Serbe des sciences et des arts, Institut des études balkaniques, Publication spéciale 45, Sarajevo, Beograd 1991, 101–110.
- Mikić, Ž. 1991, Über Anthropologie der Illyrier auf dem Boden Jugoslawiens, In: Benac, A. / Garašanin, M. / Čović, B. / Tasić, N. / Alirejsović, E. (eds.), *Tribus paléobalkaniques entre la mer Adriatique et la mer Noire de l'énéolithique jusqu'à l'époque hellénistique*, Premier symposium illyro-thrace, Niš – Blagoevgrad, 30 mai au 4 juin 1989, Académie des sciences et des arts de Bosnie et Herzégovine, Publication spéciale 94, Centre d'études balkaniques livre 14; Académie Serbe des sciences et des arts, Institut des études balkaniques, Publication spéciale 45, Sarajevo, Beograd 1991, 111–118.
- Miller, H. 1984, The Practical and Economic Background to the Greek Mercenary Explosion, Greece and Rome, second series 31 (2), 1984, 153–160.
- Morely, N. 2007, *Trade in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge 2007.
- Olsen, B. 2002, Od predmeta do teksta. Teorijske perspektive arheoloških istraživanja, Beograd 2002.
- Палавестра, А. 1989, Модели трговине и друштвене структуре на централном Балкану гвоздег доба, *Balkanica* 20, 1989, 191–209.
- Palavestra, A. 1993, Praistorijski čilbar na centralnom i zapadnom Balkanu, Beograd 1993.
- Papazoglu, F. 1969, Srednjobalkanska plemena u predrimsko doba. Tribali, Autarijati, Dardanci, Skordisci i Mezi, Sarajevo 1969.

- Papazoglu, F.* 1988, Les royaumes d'Illyrie et de Dardanie, In: Garašanin, M. (ed.), Les Illyriens et les Albanais, Serie de conférences tenues du 21 mai au 4 juin 1986, Academie Serbe des sciences et des arts, Colloques scientifiques 39, Classe de Sciences historiques 10, Beograd 1988, 173–200.
- Papajani, L.* 1973, Qyteti ilir në Klos, Studime Historike 27, 1973, 105–112.
- Papajani, L.* 1975, Klos (Fier), Iliria 3, 1975, 465–471.
- Papajani, L.* 1976a, La cité illyrienne de Klos, Iliria 4, 1976, 411–422.
- Papajani, L.* 1976b, Monedha të zbuluara në qytetin ilir në Klos, Iliria 6, 1976, 259–273.
- Паровић-Пешикан, М. 1979, Археолошка истраживања у Боки Которској, Старица 28–29, 1979, 19–67.
- Polanyi, K.* 1977, The Livelihood of Men, New York, San Francisco, London 1977.
- Polanyi, K.* 2001, The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time, Boston 2001.
- Popović, P.* 1987, Le monnayage des Scordisques. Les monnaies et la circulation monétaire dans le centre des Balkans 4e–1e s. av. n. è., Beograd, Novi Sad 1987.
- Prendi, F.* 1975a, Aspects de la vie sociale, économique et culturelle de Lissus, In: Benac, A. (ed.), Agglomération fortifiée illyriens, Colloque international à Mostar, 24 octobre au 26 octobre 1974, Academie des sciences et des arts de Bosnie et Herzégovine, Publication speciale 24, Centre d'études balkaniques livre 6, Sarajevo 1975, 149–163.
- Prendi, F.* 1975b, Un aperçu sur la civilisation de la première période du Fer en Albanie, Iliria 3, 1975, 109–138.
- Prendi, F. / Zheku, K.* 1972, La ville illyrienne de Lissus son origine et son système de fortifications, L'Illyrie 2, 1972, 239–268.
- Preucel, R.* 2006, Archaeological Semiotics, Oxford 2006.
- Rendić-Miočević, D.* 1965, Prolegomena ilirskoj numografiji, Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine 3, 1965, 77–94.
- Renfrew, C. / Bahn, P.* 1991, Archaeology. Theories, Methods and Practice, New York 1991.
- Service, E.* 1975, Origins of the State and Civilisation: The Process of Cultural Evolution, New York 1975.
- Suić, M.* 1976, Problèmes de paléogénèse et d'urbanisation des centres illyriens, Iliria 4, 1976, 357–366.
- Šalov, T.* 2010, Keramički nalazi sa lokaliteta Popove bare u Vidu kod Metkovića – antička Narona, Histria Antiqua 19, 2010, 359–377.
- Šašel-Kos, M.* 2002, Pyrrhus and Illyrian Kingdom(s?), In: Cambi, N. (ed.), Grčki utjecaj na istočnoj obali Jadrana, Grčki utjecaj na istočnoj obali Jadrana, 24.–26. rujan 1998, Split 2002, 101–120.
- Šašel-Kos, M.* 2005, Appian and Illyricum, Ljubljana 2005.
- Šašel-Kos, M.* 2008, Peoples on the Northern Fringes of the Greek World: Illyria as seen by Strabo, In: Lamboley, J. L. / Castiglioni, M. P. L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Épire dans l'Antiquité 5 (Volume 2), Actes du 5e colloque international de Grenoble L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Épire dans l'Antiquité, 10–12 octobre 2008, Grenoble 2008, 617–629.
- Tilley, C.* 1994, A Phenomenology of Landscape. Places, Paths and Monuments, Oxford 1994.
- Ujes, D.* 1999, Rhizon (Montenegrin Coast) – A Trading and Staple Town on the Crossroads of Mediterranean and Inland Balkan Routes, Late Classical and Hellenistic Pottery Evidence, Quaderni ticinesi di numismatica e antichità classiche 28, 1999, 203–220.
- Ujes, D.* 2004, Autonomous Coinage of Rhizon in Illyria, In: Cabanes, P. / Lamboley, J. L. (eds.), L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Épire dans l'antiquité 4, Actes du 4e colloque international de Grenoble, 10 au 12 octobre 2002, Paris 2004, 149–168.
- Ujes, D.* 2010, Ancient Greek Coins Finds from Risan, In: Lambogley, J. L. / Castiglioni, M. P. (eds.), L'Illyrie méridionale et Épire dans l'antiquité 5, Actes du 5e colloque international de Grenoble, 8 au 11 octobre 2008, Paris 2010, 115–132.
- Vasić, R.* 1987, Kneževski grobovi iz Novog Pazara i Atenice, In: Benac, A. (ed.), Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja 5, željezno doba, Sarajevo 1987, 644–650.
- Vasić, R.* 1991, Cultural Groups of the Early Iron Age in the West and Central Balkans and the Possibilities of their Ethnical Identification, In: Benac, A. / Garašanin, M. / Čović, B. / Tasić, N. / Alirejsović, E. (eds.), Tribus paléobalkaniques entre la mer Adriatique et la mer Noire de l'énéolithique jusqu'à l'époque hellénistique, Premier symposium illyro-thrace, Niš – Blagoevgrad, 30 mai au 4 juin 1989, Academie des sciences et des arts de Bosnie et Herzégovine, Publication speciale 94, Centre d'études balkaniques, livre 14; Academie Serbe des sciences et des arts, Institut des études balkaniques, Publication speciale 45, Sarajevo, Beograd 1991, 73–82.
- Vasilj, S.* 1992, Novčić Oite s Ošanića, Prilozi instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu 9 (1), 1992, 131–134.
- Vasilj, S.* 2003, Novčić Fokide s gradine u Ošanićima kod Stoca, Radovi Zavoda povijesnih znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Zadru 45, 2003, 1–5.
- Velimirović-Žižić, O.* 1967, Labeati i Dokleati kroz izvore i arheološki materijal, Materijali 4, 1967, 61–64.
- Vrekaj, B.* 1997, Tipare të qeramiksë së zbuluar në Bylis shek. IV p. e. s.–I e. s., Iliria 27, 1997, 167–204.
- Wilkes, J.* 1992, The Illyrians, Oxford 1992.