

# Na razmeđu svjetova za prijelaza milenija: kasno brončano doba na Kvarneru

---

**Blečić Kavur, Martina**

**Authored book / Autorska knjiga**

*Publication status / Verzija rada:* **Published version / Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)**

*Publication year / Godina izdavanja:* **2014**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:300:320224>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2025-02-27**



*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[AMZdepo - Repository of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb](#)



Martina Blečić Kavur

***Na razmeđu svjetova za prijelaza milenija:  
Kasno brončano doba na Kvarneru***

*At the crossroads of worlds at the turn of the millennium:  
The Late Bronze Age in the Kvarner region*

**Musei Archaeologici Zagrabienis Catalogi  
et Monographiae**

Katalozi i monografije Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu  
Svezak XI

**Martina Blečić Kavur**

Na razmeđu svjetova za prijelaza milenija:  
Kasno brončano doba na Kvarneru

*Urednica:*

**Jacqueline Balen**

*Tehnički urednik:*

**Srećko Škrinjarić**

*Recenzenti:*

**Andrej Gaspari, Daria Ložnjak Dizdar,  
Nives Majnarić Pandžić, Biba Teržan**

*Hrvatska lektura:*

**Božena Bunčić**

*Prijevod na engleski jezik:*

**Boris Kavur**

*Engleska lektura:*

**Agnes Milovan Solter**

*Crteži:*

**Miljenka Galić, Vasja Vidmar – Vasko, Martina Blečić Kavur**

*Fotografije:*

**Martina Blečić Kavur, Igor Krajcar**

*Grafika i kartografija:*

**Martina Blečić Kavur**

*Oblikovanje:*

**Krunoslav Vlahović  
Mrak Studio**

*Tisak:*

**Tiskara Zelina d.d.**

*Naklada:*

**500 primjeraka**



CIP zapis dostupan u računalnome katalogu Nacionalne i sveučilišne  
knjižnice u Zagrebu pod brojem 879255.  
ISBN: 978-9536789-78-8

**Musei Archaeologici Zagrabienis Catalogi  
et Monographiae**

Katalozi i monografije Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu  
Volume XI

**Martina Blečić Kavur**

At the crossroads of worlds at the turn of the millennium:  
The Late Bronze Age in the Kvarner region

*Editor:*

**Jacqueline Balen**

*Technical editor:*

**Srećko Škrinjarić**

*Reviewers:*

**Andrej Gaspari, Daria Ložnjak Dizdar,  
Nives Majnarić Pandžić, Biba Teržan**

*Croatian language editor:*

**Božena Bunčić**

*English translation:*

**Boris Kavur**

*English language editor:*

**Agnes Milovan Solter**

*Drawings:*

**Miljenka Galić, Vasja Vidmar – Vasko, Martina Blečić Kavur**

*Photographs:*

**Martina Blečić Kavur, Igor Krajcar**

*Graphics and maps:*

**Martina Blečić Kavur**

*Design:*

**Krunoslav Vlahović  
Mrak Studio**

*Print:*

**Tiskara Zelina d.d.**

*Printed in:*

**500 copies**

**Ponosni sponzori:**



SOCIETE GENERALE GROUP



TRIGLAV OSIGURANJE d.d.

Na razmeđu svjetova za prijelaza milenija:

# Kasno brončano doba na Kvarneru

AT THE CROSSROADS OF WORLDS AT THE TURN  
OF THE MILLENNIUM: THE LATE BRONZE AGE IN  
THE KVARNER REGION

Martina  
Blečić Kavur



## Sadržaj / Content

Proslov / Foreword (J. Balen) .....	7
Predgovor / Preface (L. Bakarić) .....	9
Uvod / Introduction .....	11
Prostorni obuhvati i prirodna obilježja Kvarnera / Regional comprehension and natural characteristics of the Kvarner area .....	17
Prostorni obuhvat / Regional comprehension .....	17
Karakter geološko-morfološke strukture reljefa / Geomorphological characteristics of the relief .....	19
Klimatske i ekološke osobine / Climatic and ecological characteristics of the region .....	21
Nalazišta i pregled njihova istraživanja / The sites and the history of their research .....	25
Tipološka klasifikacija, kronološka determinacija, kulturološka interpretacija / Typological classification, chronological determination and cultural interpretation .....	43
Egzotizmi i lokalizmi kulturne <i>koiné</i> / Exoticisms and localisms of the cultural <i>koiné</i> .....	45
O fibulama sa dva dugmeta na luku i "Sredozemnoj" <i>koiné</i> / On fibulae with two knobs on the bow and the "Mediterranean" <i>koiné</i> .....	45
O iglama s lukovičastom glavicom i "Kontinentalnoj" <i>koiné</i> / On pins with onion-shaped head and the "Continental" <i>koiné</i> .....	72
Regionalne <i>koiné</i> kraja kasnog brončanog i prijelaza na željezno doba / The regional <i>koiné</i> from the end of the Late Bronze Age and the transition to the Iron Age .....	105
O zmijastim fibulama i "Jadranskoj" <i>koiné</i> / On serpentine fibulae and the "Adriatic" <i>koiné</i> .....	120
<i>Društvena činjenica i povijesna istina / A social fact and the political truth</i> .....	150
Katalog / Catalogue .....	167
Liste nalazišta / Lists of finds .....	201
Literatura / Literature .....	203
Table / Plates .....	224



## Proslov

Serija *Musei Archaeologici Zagrabensis Catalogi et Monographiae* (Katalozi i monografije Arheološkoga muzeja u Zagrebu) pokrenuta je 2004. godine s ciljem da se javnosti prikažu pojedini tematski segmenti iznimno bogatog fundusa koji se čuva u Arheološkom muzeju u Zagrebu. Dosad je u seriji objavljeno deset svezaka u kojima su autori, većinom muzejski djelatnici, na stručno-znanstveni način obradili i predstavili dio spomeničkog fundusa iz različitih zbirki Muzeja.

Autorica ovog sveska, Martina Blečić Kavur, dugogodišnja je suradnica Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu. Upravo je u muzejskom glasilu, *Vjesniku Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, obilježen početak njezine istraživačke karijere; objavom diplomskog rada. Slijedila je objava još pet znanstvenih radova, a najzad ispred nas je i njezin najveći doprinos; 11. svezak muzejske edicije *Kataloga i monografija*.

Aktualni svezak, *Na razmeđu svjetova za prijelaza milenija: Kasno brončano doba na Kvarneru*, kako i sam naslov jasno ukazuje, obrađuje arheološke nalaze iz posljednjih stoljeća 2. i prijelaza na 1. tisućljeće pr. Kr. na prostoru Kvarnera, u širokoj perspektivi između sredozemnih i srednjoeuropskih kultura. Knjiga je zapravo dopunjena trećina doktorske disertacije autorice koju je, 2010. godine, uspješno obranila na Filozofskom fakultetu u Ljubljani (Slovenija), pod mentorstvom profesorice Bibe Teržan i koja je, zajedno s profesoricom Nives Majnarić Pandžić, recenzentica ovog monografskog izdanja.

Ona predstavlja bogat i iznimno zanimljiv spomenički materijal koji se čuva u Arheološkom muzeju u Zagrebu. Posebno je izdvojen i, prvi put, u cijelosti katalogiziran, zbog čega djelo slijedi pravilo sustavnog objavljivanja muzejske građe, jednog od prioriteta same edicije. Međutim, najveći doprinos ovog djela je interpretacija nalaza u odnosu na svu poznatu istraženu građu s područja Kvarnera, vremenski i prostorno uklopljenu u zadanu tematiku knjige. Budući da je muzejska građa pohranjena unutar Japodske zbirke Pretpovijesnog odjela, uvodno poglavlje potpisuje njezina voditeljica, viša kustosica Lidija Bakarić. Na jasan način istaknula je svu težinu i vrijednost takvog pristupa u sistematiziranju i kritičkom vrednovanju materijalne kulture s jednog područja.

Pred vama je tako sveobuhvatno djelo u kojemu se analizira dosad objavljena, ali i neobjavljena građa, prikupljana u više od dva stoljeća. Autorica, na sebi svojstven način, s novom valorizacijom i u drugačijoj perspektivi, prikazuje važnost područja sjevernoga Jadrana na prijelazu posljednjeg pretpovijesnog milenija, s naglašenim prožimanjima različitih utjecaja kako iz kontinentalnih dijelova jugoistočnog alpskog i panonskog prostora tako i iz sredozemnih kultura, ponajviše iz italjskog kulturnog miljea.

Knjiga Martine Blečić Kavur zasigurno nije zanimljiva samo zbog predstavljanja katalogizirane muzejske građe, niti isključivo zbog

## Foreword

The book series *Musei Archaeologici Zagrabensis Catalogi et Monographiae* (Catalogues and Monographs of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb) was started in 2004 to present to the public individual thematic segments of the extremely rich fund kept in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. Ten volumes have been published so far, in which the authors, mostly museum specialists, analyzed and presented parts of the finds kept in different collections of the Museum.

The author of the present volume, Martina Blečić Kavur, has collaborated with the Museum for years. It was in *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, the journal published here, that her scientific career started when she published a contribution extracted from her diploma thesis. In the following years she published five more articles on her research, and finally, before us is her major contribution, the 11th volume of the *Catalogues and Monographs* series.

The present book, entitled *At the crossroads of worlds at the turn of the millennium: The Late Bronze Age in the Kvarner region*, as suggested by the title itself, presents the archaeological finds discovered on the Kvarner territory from the last centuries of the second and the first centuries of the first millennium BC, but they are observed in a broader perspective between Mediterranean and central European cultures. The book is actually a supplemented version of only one third of the author's doctoral dissertation, which she successfully defended in 2010 on the Faculty of Arts in Ljubljana (Slovenia) under the supervision of professor Biba Teržan, who is, together with professor Nives Majnarić Pandžić, also the reviewer of this publication.

It presents a rich and exceptionally interesting corpus of finds kept in the Archaeological museum in Zagreb, which has been singled out and catalogued for the first time, which is why the book follows the rules of systematic publication of artifacts preserved in museums – being one of the main priorities of this edition. However, the main contribution of this work is the interpretation of finds in relation to all other known discoveries from the Kvarner territory, which is chronologically and spatially integrated into the given topic of the book. And, since the finds are preserved in the Japodian collection of the Prehistoric Department, the foreword was authored by its head, senior curator Lidija Bakarić. It is in an intelligible manner that she pointed out the complexity and importance of such an approach of systematically and analytically evaluating the finds from a given region.

In front of you is an all-embracing treatise analyzing the already published, but also unpublished archaeological finds collected in the course of more than two centuries. The author, leaving her personal touch, with a new valorization and in a different perspective, presents the importance of the territory of the northern Adriatic at the turn of the last prehistoric millennium, by accentuating the connection of differ-



predstavljanja jednog područja, već je njezina vrijednost upravo u interpretaciji kulturnih procesa na kraju brončanoga doba čitave jadranske regije i njezina zaleđa. Usmjerenom k čitateljima, ovaj će svezak zasigurno slijediti put uspješnica prethodnih izdanja te održati razinu stručnog i znanstvenog standarda edicije *Kataloga i monografija Arheološkoga muzeja u Zagrebu*.

Naposljetku, valja istaknuti i zahvaliti svima koji su pridonijeli nastanku knjige i pomogli u pripremi njezina konačnog "izgleda". Gradski ured za obrazovanje, kulturu i sport Grada Zagreba, Ministarstvo kulture Republike Hrvatske kao i Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i sporta Republike Hrvatske od samog su početka prepoznali važnost izlaza serije kao i predočene monografije. Izražavamo im posebnu zahvalnost za financijsku potporu.

*Jacqueline Balen*

ent influences ranging from the continental, south-eastern Alpine and Pannonian territory, to Mediterranean cultures – in particular from the Italic cultural environment.

The book by Martina Blečić Kavur is not interesting only due to the presented catalogued finds from the Museum, nor due to the presentation of a region, but its value is in the interpretation of the cultural processes at the end of the Bronze Age on the territory of the Adriatic region and its hinterlands. By addressing the readers this volume will surely achieve the success of previous publications, maintaining the scientific standards of the editions of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb.

Finally, we have to thank all those who contributed to the publication of this book and helped in the preparation of its final "shape". The Zagreb Municipal Office of Education, Culture and Sports, Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia and the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports of the Republic of Croatia recognized the importance of this series and of the present book from the very beginning. Therefore, we would like to express our gratitude for their financial support.

*Jacqueline Balen*

## Predgovor

Istraživanje jednog određenog područja nije jednostavno. Od gomile pisanih podataka koje nam današnja znanstvena saznanja i moderna tehnologija pružaju – mnoštva novotiskanih i starih knjiga, znanstvenih i popularnih časopisa, novinskih članaka, internetskih portala itd. treba izdvojiti upravo one naslove, i ne samo naslove, možda samo pojedine rečenice, koji se tiču zadanog problema. A onda treba prikupljene podatke obraditi, sistematizirati, kritički se osvrnuti na njih ... i tako dalje... Ogroman je to posao. Upravo taj posao je napravljen i prezentiran u monografiji koja ima temu *Na razmeđu svjetova za prijelaza milenija: Kasno brončano doba na Kvarneru*.

Prve arheološke bilješke o tom području datiraju iz 17. stoljeća (Valvasor), a arheološka istraživanja provode se od 19. stoljeća u jednakoj mjeri na priobalnom i na otočnom dijelu. Do 20. stoljeća, kao i u mnogim drugim krajevima, građa se sakupljala za formiranje pojedinih zbirki i muzeja, iskopavanja su vršili amateri, muzejski povjerenici, rijetko arheolozi, a dokumentacija iskopavanja najčešće se nije vodila, ili se vodila djelomično. Ono malo dokumentacije s istraživanja koja je preživjela do današnjih dana dragocjeni su podaci koji govore o tadašnjoj valorizaciji arheoloških nalazišta, pridavanju važnosti pronađenim artefaktima, otkrivanju do tada nepoznatih detalja o (pre) povijesti kraja. Tek od druge polovine 20. stoljeća započinju arheološka iskopavanja predvođena arheolozima, popraćena pisanom dokumentacijom i tek ponekom fotografijom. Iskopavanja se cjelovito ili djelomično objavljuju, a građa se pohranjuje u nadležne muzeje ili zbirke. Sva ta dokumentacija, objavljene crtice o istraživanjima ili cjeloviti izvještaji o iskopavanjima, kao i prikupljeni arheološki materijal pohranjen u različite ustanove sistematiziran je i obrađen u ovoj opsežnoj monografiji. Cjeloviti pristup regiji Kvarnera počinje s geografskim određenjem i karakteristikama kraja te s popisom nalazišta i pregledom povijesti njihova istraživanja. Brojni lokaliteti te regije većinom nisu dovoljno istraženi, ili su samo evidentirani, a u odnosu na druge regije količina pronađenih arheoloških predmeta je mala, ali dovoljna za novu interpretaciju.

Dugo vremenena područje Kvarnera smatrano je rubnim područjem liburnske skupine te je građa interpretirana kao njezin sastavni dio. Međutim, detaljna analiza arheološke baštine koja je prezentirana u monografiji pokazala je drugačije rezultate. Posebno je naglašena multikulturalnost regije, s obzirom na izvanredni zemljopisni položaj u kojem otoci predstavljaju most između (sjeverne) Italije i velebitskog zaleđa. Uostalom, Rijeka je i danas najvažnija trgovačka luka tog dijela sjevernog Jadrana. Multikulturalnost se očituje u prisutnosti utjecaja kontinenta, odnosno Kulture polja sa žarama, japodske, notranjske, škocjansko-kraške, histarske, liburnske skupine te, naravno, prisustvo mnoštva italskih elemenata. Miješanje kultura očituje

## Preface

Conducting research on a specific territory is not an easy task. Out from a pile of written sources made accessible by modern scientific findings and modern technologies – from multitudes of reprinted and old books, scientific and professional articles, newspaper reports, internet portals and similar – only such titles have to be extracted, and sometimes not titles, but only individual sentences, that concern the problem that has been selected. Then, the collected data must be handled, systemized and critically reflected upon... and so on again and again... This is a major task, and it is exactly this type of task that was accomplished and presented in this volume entitled *At the crossroads of worlds at the turn of the millennium: The Late Bronze Age in the Kvarner region*.

The first archaeological notes about this territory date back to the 17<sup>th</sup> century (Valvasor), whereas archaeological research was conducted with the same intensity both on the costal and the insular part, since the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Until the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as in many other areas, the finds were collected for individual collections and museums, with excavations conducted by amateurs, museum commissioners, and only rarely by archaeologists with partial excavations documentation or none. The poorly preserved documentation of this research presents valuable data showing the then valorisation of archaeological sites, the value attributed to discovered artefacts, and the discovery of previously unknown details about the (pre)history of the area. It was only since the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century that the research started to be conducted by archaeologists, accompanied by written records and sometimes by few photographs of the excavations. Excavations started to be entirely or partly published, whereas finds were transferred into the relevant museums or collections. All that documentation, the published excavation notes or complete reports about the excavations, as well as the collected archaeological finds preserved in different institutions, have been systematically gathered and discussed in this comprehensive monograph.

An integral approach to the Kvarner region starts with its geographic determination, a presentation of the local characteristics, followed by a list of sites and of a historical overview of research conducted on them. Numerous sites in the region were insufficiently explored, or were only recorded. Consequently, compared to other regions, the quantity of artefacts is relatively small, but still sufficient for a new interpretation.

For a long time the Kvarner region was considered a marginal area of the Liburnian cultural group and the finds discovered here were interpreted as a part of it. However, a detailed analysis of the archaeological heritage, introduced in the present book, produced different results. Particularly emphasized is the multicultural character of the region, and this because of its outstanding geographical location, in which the islands act as a bridge between (northern) Italy and the Velebit hinterland. Incidentally, Rijeka is still the most important trading port of this part of northern

se u istovremenim ali raznorodnim običajima načina pokopavanja umrlih, grobnim priložima koji se očituju u (sačuvanim) dijelovima pogrebne nošnje, kao i nakitu te u (malobrojnim) dijelovima osobne opreme i oružja. U cijeloj regiji vidljivo je prožimanje utjecaja i kulturnih dotoka iz kontinentalnih dijelova jugoistočnoalpskog prostora i iz italiskog kulturnog miljea.

Ne mali značaj važnosti regije daju i antički pisci, koji otoke Cres i Lošinj nazivaju *Apsirtidi* (prema osobi iz legende o Argonautima, koja je poginula upravo na tom mjestu), današnji otok Krk – *Elektridi*, važnoj stanici na tzv. Jantarnom putu te otočnu skupinu Rab i Pag *Mentori*. Plinije Stariji govori o nalazištima kositra na kvarnerskim otocima, ali bi se ta informacija mogla odnositi na redistribuciju kositra, uostalom kao i otok Krk, na kojem nema prirodnog jantara, ali je, sada dokazano, bila važna stanica u redistribuciji tog materijala.

Zbog svega navedenog, izdvajanje zasebne skupine na prostoru sjevernog Jadrana u Kvarnersku skupinu kasnog brončanog i početka starijeg željeznog doba svakako ima opravdanja. Iscrpnost analiza, povezivanje građe, navođenje brojnog komparativnog materijala, ovu knjigu uvrstit će u nezaobilaznu literaturu svakog čitatelja koji želi saznati nešto više o regiji Kvarnera i o sjevernom Jadrano.

Lidija Bakarić

Adriatic. The multicultural character of the area could be observed in the presence of influences from the continent, i.e. from the Urnfield culture, from the Japodian, Notranjska and from the Škocjan-Kras cultural group, as well as from Histrian and from Liburnian group and, of course, with the presence of a multitude of Italic elements. The mixing of cultures is observable in the simultaneous but differing rituals of inhumation, grave goods which represent the (preserved) elements of funerary attire as well as in jewelry and (scarce) elements of personal gear and weaponry. In the whole region, a blending of influences and cultural elements from the continental areas, the south-eastern Alpine and the Italic cultural environment may be observed.

A special importance is ascribed to the region by ancient writers who called the islands of Cres and Lošinj *Apsirtides* (after a person from the legend of the Argonauts which should have died on this exact spot), the island of Krk – an important station in the so called Amber route – *Electrides* and the island group of Rab and Pag – *Mentorides*. Plinius the Elder mentioned the deposits of thin on the islands of Kvarner, but this information could have been linked to the redistribution of this raw material. In the same way, the island of Krk does not have natural occurrences of amber, but was still, as demonstrated, an important location for its redistribution.

Considering all the aforementioned, it is definitely justifiable to single out an individual cultural group, i.e. the Kvarner group, located on the territory of the northern Adriatic in the Late Bronze and at the beginning of the Early Iron Age. The exhaustive analysis, the linking of the finds and the listing of numerous comparisons provided in this book will place it amongst the mandatory literature of any reader willing to find out more about the Kvarner region and the northern Adriatic.

Lidija Bakarić



## Uvod

Knjiga koja je upravo iznašla put do Vas uspjela je to s razlogom! Jer, knjige, kao i svaki predmet, imaju svoju dušu i vlastitu prošlost koja zavređuje određeno poštovanje. Zadržati će se samo kod onoga koji im to omogućuje. Naime, ovo je "predmet" o ponovno nađenim predmetima. O izgubljenim stvarima. O zakopanim dragocjenostima. O osobnom i kolektivnom, o voljenom i čuванom, o odbačenom i nepoželjnom, o starom i novom, o simbolima i metaforama... o predmetima koji su obilježili ne samo njihovu vlastitu, nego i moju, našu, zajedničku prošlost. U ciklusima njihovih života "duša" im je pročišćena, a prošlost zato iznimno daleka. "Ponovnim rođenjem" u vremenu našega doba dobili su priliku interpretacije njihove vlastite prošlosti, što je iznimno složena i nikad okončana "misija". No, s pouzdanom provokacijom i besprijevakornim poticanjem, istraživanja njihovih značenja, vrednota i pozadine, u još širem, još većem i još detaljnijem kulturnom kontekstu otkrivaju nam "svjetove" svijesti i znanja o vremenu njihove sadašnjosti. Vrijeme je to tzv. kasnog brončanog doba, izuzetnog razdoblja posljednjih stoljeća 2. i prijelaza na 1. milenij stare ere. Specifičnu manifestaciju imalo je na prostoru sjevernog Jadrana, posebno na području Kvarnera – mjesta mojeg "predmeta", naše prošlosti i zajedničkog nam trenutka sadašnjosti. Kvarner je dakle "polazišna točka" za svaki pojedini, odabrani predmet predstavljen u ovoj knjizi. S određenim "oblikom", koji se uspio održati ili "preživjeti" više od 3000 godina, ti su predmeti pristigli do mene/nas u izuzetno reduciranom broju, u pojedinim stanjima koja su nerijetko iziskivala stanovite napore u pokušaju razumijevanja njihovog izvornog, primarnog, sekundarnog i prenesenog značenja. A, budući da je riječ o jednoj od najslabije istraživanih regija istočnojadranskog priobalja, kao i unutar političkih granica Hrvatske, u ovoj ih je knjizi predstavljen, analiziran i interpretiran dojmljiv broj. Premda je većina te građe objavljena i već dobro poznata u stručnoj literaturi, odnos prema njoj nije uvijek bio zadovoljavajući. Dapače, ne tako rijetko bio je usputan ili krajnje obescijenjen, lišen upravo određenog poštovanja. S obzirom na tu, i u novije vrijeme iznova potvrđenu činjenicu, a u perspektivi onodobne kulture življenja i ponašanja, nastojala sam tom poznatom fundusu predmeta pridodati još veći broj predmeta, bilo iz starih, a zaboravljenih objava, bilo iz slučajnih nalaza ili privatnih vlasništva, te napokon i iz novijih istraživanja. Posljedično, samo se manji broj predmeta objavljuje po prvi puta, no zato je kulturni, stilsko-tipološki, interakcijski i značenjski kontekst njihove biti i "duše" u onodobnoj prostranoj mreži istovrijednih vještina i znanja, prilično proširen i, nadam se, pojašnjen. "Stari" i "novi" predmeti združeni tako u jednome "predmetu" preusmjerit će manipuliranje njima, a time i vrednovanje kulturne prošlosti i baštine jednog od najzanimljivijih i najživopisnijih mjesta čitavog Jadranskog bazena.

## Introduction

The present book which has just made its way to you did so for a reason. It is because books, just like any other objects, have their own soul and their own history that have to be respected, and they will stay only with such persons who pay them respect. In fact, this book is an "object" about objects that have been re-discovered. It is about lost things, about buried treasures, personal and collective, beloved and kept, discarded and unwanted, old and new, about symbols and metaphors... it is about objects that did not mark only their own, but also my and our common past. In the course of their life cycles their "soul" has been purified and their past is thus very remote. Through a "rebirth" in our era they got a chance to have their past interpreted, which is a complex and never ending "mission". However, with a reliable provocation and a perfect motivation, the research of their meanings, values and backgrounds within a broader, larger and more detailed cultural context, enables us to discover "worlds" of consciousness and knowledge about the period of their then present. This was the time of the so called Late Bronze Age, an exceptional period covering the last centuries of the 2nd and the transition to the 1st millennium BC. It displays a specific manifestation on the territory of the northern Adriatic, in particular on the Kvarner territory – the area of my "object", of my past and of our common present. The Kvarner area is the "point of departure" of every single, selected object presented in this book. In a specific "form", which managed to be preserved or to "survive" for more than 3.000 years these artifacts reached me/us in extremely reduced quantities and in states of preservation which often required much effort in trying to understand their initial, primary, secondary and metaphorical meaning. Since this is one of the most poorly researched areas of the eastern Adriatic coast, as well as on the territory of today's Croatia, this book presents, analyzes and interprets an impressive number of finds. Although the majority of those objects was published and is well known in the scientific literature, the attitude to those finds was often not satisfactory. In fact, it was an attitude of superficiality and underestimation, depriving them of that certain respect. It is because of such an attitude, which has unfortunately been confirmed lately, and from the perspective of that ancient culture of living and behaving, that I have tried to include amongst known artifacts also such finds from old, forgotten publications, both from chance finds and private property, as well as recent discoveries. This is why only a smaller number of finds has been published for the first time. However, the cultural, stylistic and typological, interactive and significant context of their essence and "soul" within the vast network of knowledge and skills of that past has been significantly extended and explained. "Old" and "new" artifacts united into one single "object" will redirect their manipulation and thereby also the evaluation of their cultural past and heritage of one of the most interesting and most colorful areas of the whole Adriatic basin.

Knjiga obuhvaća nekoliko tematskih cjelina. Uvodne rasprave, o prostornom obuhvatu i prirodnim obilježjima Kvarnera, te pregled arheoloških nalazišta i njihova istraživanja, pružaju osnovna upoznavanja i dočaravaju situaciju pozadine sljedećem i najvažnijem dijelu knjige; *Tipološka klasifikacija, kronološka determinacija, kulturološka interpretacija*. U tom je poglavlju arheološkom metodom analizirana sva prikupljena građa, interpretirana u širem prostornom i kulturnom okruženju. Postavljene i prihvaćene interpretacije kroz završno su poglavlje konceptualno relativizirane, raspravljane i u mogućem kontekstu društvenog potencijala i kulturno-povijesnih manifestacija koje dosad na taj način nisu bile kritički vrednovane.

Međutim, velik izbor predstavljene građe izdvojen je u katalogu i prikazan u crtežima na tablama, što je učinjeno s razlogom. Riječ je, naime, o predmetima koji su, istraživanjima ili pribavljanjima, s prostora sjevernog i istočnog Kvarnera još od 19. stoljeća pristizali u Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu. Zahvaljujući djelatnicama njegova Pretpovijesnog odjela, muzejskoj savjetnici Dubravki Balen-Letunić i višoj kustosici Lidiji Bakarić, građa mi je susretljivo ustupljena za obrađivanje i objavljivanje, daleke 2000. godine. Suradnja s Arheološkim muzejom ostvarena je i na drugim razinama istraživačkog rada i dinamike; svu je građu iscrtala Miljenka Galić, umjetničke fotografije izradio je Igor Krajcar, a veliku pomoć pružili su mi Ana Solter i Srećko Škrinjarić, svi s Odjela za dokumentaciju. Međutim, od samog početka veliku prijateljsku podršku, razumijevanje i poticaj pružila mi je i tadašnja kustosica Odjela Jacqueline Balen. Upravo njezinom zaslugom, u svojstvu ravnateljice te institucije, knjiga je prihvaćena za objavljivanje, a njezinim naporima u angažmanu urednice serije *Kataloga i monografija* ostvarene su sve mogućnosti da knjiga dobije upravo željeni oblik. S velikim poštovanjem upućujem Vam riječi iskrene zahvalnosti.

Nadalje, preostalu građu s prostora Kvarnera koju ovdje predstavljam, analiziram, poneku i prvi put objavljujem, a dokumentirana je u zasebnom katalogu i prikazana kroz slikovni materijal u sadržajnom dijelu teksta, pružile su mi na obradu brojne stručne institucije. Stoga sam zahvalna svim kolegama koji su mi na razne načine to i omogućili: ponajprije Željki Cetinić (Rijeka), Margiti Cvijetinović Starac i Ranku Starcu (Pomorski i povijesni muzej Hrvatskog primorja Rijeka, Rijeka), zatim Zrinki Ettinger Starčić (Lošinjski muzej, Mali Lošinj), Tei Rosić (Muzej grada Crikvenice), Darku Komši i Kristini Mihovilić (Arheološki muzej Istre, Pula), Morani Čaušević-Bully (Ecole française de Rome, Roma) i Miljenku Jurkoviću (Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb), Emilu Podrugu (Muzej grada Šibenika, Šibenik), Mati Radoviću (Muzej ninskih starina, Nin) te župniku Antonu Zecu (Župna zbirka Desetinec, Vrbnik). Crteže je dijelom iscrtao i precrtao Vasja Vidmar–Vasko (Piran). Završni pečat pri konačnom oblikovanju knjige ostvaren je angažmanom i sljedećeg tima stručnjaka: prijevod je djelo Borisa Kavura (Univerza na Pimorskem, Inštitut za dediščino Sredozemlja, Koper), lekture

The book has several units. The introductory discussions about the spatial reach and the natural features of the Kvarner area, as well as an overview of the sites and history of research provide basic information and illustrate the situation that follows in the most important part of the book – i.e. the *Typological classification, chronological determination and cultural interpretation* – containing all the finds that have been collected, by applying the archaeological method, but which have been analyzed and interpreted within a broader spatial and cultural context. The interpretations set and accepted are put into a more relative perspective in the final chapter, they are discussed within a reconstructed context of social potential, of cultural and historical manifestations which have not been critically evaluated in this way so far.

However, a substantial portion of the presented finds has been singled out in the catalogue and presented as illustrations on plates, and the reason for doing so lies in the fact that these are items that have reached the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, either through research or acquisition, from the northern and eastern region of the Kvarner territory since the 19th century. It was thanks to the members of the Prehistoric Department, museum advisor Dubravka Balen-Letunić and senior curator Lidija Bakarić, that I could access the finds for analysis and publication in 2000. The collaboration with the Archaeological Museum was realized also on several other levels of research – all the finds were illustrated by Miljenka Galić, artistic photographs were produced by Igor Krajcar and a lot of help was provided by Ana Solter and Srećko Škrinjarić, all from the Documentation Department. In addition, from the very beginning I was offered immense friendly support, understanding and motivation by the then Department curator Jacqueline Balen. It is thanks to her in her capacity as Museum director, that the present book was accepted for publication. Furthermore, it was with her efforts and engagement as editor of the series *Catalogues and monographs*, that the present book could obtain the desired form and shape. Therefore, it is with great respect that I would like to express my deepest gratitude to all of you.

The remaining finds from the Kvarner territory, that have been presented, analyzed and several of them published for the very first time, have been documented in a separate catalogue and illustrated in the text, were provided to me for research by numerous professional institutions. I have to thank all colleagues who made this possible in different ways – first of all Željka Cetinić (Rijeka), Margita Cvijetinović Starac and Ranko Starac (Pomorski i povijesni muzeja Hrvatskog primorja Rijeka, Rijeka), further Zrinka Ettinger Starčić (Lošinjski muzej, Mali Lošinj), Tea Rosić (Muzej grada Crikvenice), Darko Komšo and Kristina Mihovilić (Arheološki muzej Istre, Pula), Morana Čaušević-Bully (Ecole française de Rome, Roma) and Miljenko Jurković (Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb), Emil Podrug (Muzej grada Šibenika, Šibenik), Mate Radović (Muzej ninskih starina, Nin) and parish priest Anton Zec (Župna zbirka Desetinec, Vrbnik). The illustrations were partly drawn and redrawn by Vasja Vidmar–Vasko (Piran). The finishing touch in the final design of the book was realized with the

potpisuju Božena Bunčić i Agnes Milovan Solter (Zagreb), a prijelom Kruno Vlahović (Mrak Studio, Donja Stubica). Na toj prekrasnoj suradnji, konkretnom i korektnom poticaju te dobronamjernim savjetima bit ću vam uvijek iznimno zahvalna.

Napokon, studija koja je pred vama rezultat je višegodišnjeg istraživačkog rada kojeg sam provodila još od studentskih dana i tijekom poslijediplomskog studija na Sveučilištu u Zagrebu i na Univerzi v Ljubljani. Ondje sam, u obliku doktorske disertacije, istraživanja i donekle zaključila. Razdoblje kasnog brončanog i prijelaza na željezo doba samo je jedna trećina disertacije koja je prilično nadopunjena i prilagođena ovom obliku monografskog izdanja. Željela bih se stoga najprije zahvaliti mentoricama, profesoricama Nives Majnarić Pandžić (Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb) i Bibi Teržan (Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta, Ljubljana), koje su prihvatile, poticale i susretljivo pomagale istraživački rad od njegova začetka pa do (trenutnog) konca, predstavljajući se ovdje i kao njegove recenzentice. Studijski boravak na Freie Universität-u u Berlinu, 2005. godine, konačno je zaokrenuo i pokrenuo moju kritičku misao kao i praktičnu svijest. Ondje sam uspjela pridobiti mnogo vrijednih iskustava, a ispred svega mnogo nužne literature kojom se i danas obilno koristim. Sve to ostvarila sam velikom zaslugom i nesebičnom pomoći profesora Bernharda Hänsela (Freie Universität, Institut für Prähistorische Archäologie, Berlin). Isto tako, svoje je karizmatično obilježje i znanstvenu širinu podario posebno profesor Mitja Guštin (Univerza na Pimorskem, Inštitut za dediščino Sredozemlja, Koper), čija mi je bogata privatna i "piranska knjižnica" godinama bila na apsolutnom raspolaganju. Vama, dragi moji profesori, posebno velika hvala.

Studij kao i specijalističko-istraživačke boravke u inozemstvima financijski su bili omogućeni i/ili potpomognuti sredstvima raznih "mecena". Riječ je o stipendijama koje sam dobila, u prvome od Ministarstva znanosti, obrazovanja i športa te Ministarstva kulture Republike Hrvatske, zatim od Ministarstva za visoko školstvo, znanost i tehnologiju Republike Slovenije te Njemačke službe za akademsku razmjenu (DAAD) i Rotary Cluba Opatija. Napokon i tisak same knjige potpomognut je sredstvima Ministarstva kulture i Ministarstva znanosti, obrazovanja i sporta Republike Hrvatske te Gradskog ureda za obrazovanje, kulturu i šport Grada Zagreba. Svima zahvaljujem na pruženoj pomoći, jer bez vas ništa ne bi bilo ovakvo kakvo jest.

Kako bi istraživanje bilo što potpunije i cjelovitije, u nizu mojih studijskih putovanja koja su uglavnom poduzeta vlastitom inicijativom i osobnim angažmanom prilikom čega sam imala mogućnosti pogledati ogroman izbor građe od "Alpa do Jadrana i Egeje", ali i prikupiti nebrojeno mnogo literature, pomogli su mi također brojni prijatelji i kolege: Blagoje Govedarica i Alexander Möser (Freie Universität, Institut für Prähistorische Archäologie, Berlin), Christoph Guthjar (Kulturpark Hengist, Wildon) i Georg Tiefengraber (Institut für südostalpine Bronze- und Eisenzeitforschung, Judenburg), Nuccia Negroni Catacchio (Università degli

engagement of the following team of experts: the translation was done by Boris Kavur (Univerza na Pimorskem, Inštitut za dediščino Sredozemlja, Koper), the language editing by Božena Bunčić and Agnes Milovan Solter (Zagreb), whereas the layout is the work of Kruno Vlahović (Mrak Studio, Donja Stubica). I will always be grateful to all of you for this wonderful collaboration, concrete and correct encouragement and benevolent advice.

Finally, the study before you is the result of numerous years of research that has been my occupation since my student days and throughout my postgraduate studies at the Universities in Zagreb and Ljubljana. It was at the latter that I concluded the research (up to a certain degree) in the form of a doctoral dissertation. The period of the Late Bronze and the transition to the Early Iron Age was only one third of my Dissertation which has been supplemented and modified to this form of monograph publication. First of all, I would like to thank my mentors, professor Nives Majnarić Pandžić (Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb) and Biba Teržan (Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta, Ljubljana), that accepted, encouraged and supported my research from the very beginning to the (for the time being) end accepting to be reviewers of the present book. The research stay at the Freie Universität in Berlin in 2005 definitely triggered my critical reasoning and practical consciousness. In Berlin I gained much valuable experience and a large amount of literature which I still consult a lot. All this was made possible by the unselfish help of professor Bernhard Hänsel (Freie Universität, Institut für Prähistorische Archäologie, Berlin). Equally so, professor Mitja Guštin (Univerza na Pimorskem, Inštitut za dediščino Sredozemlja, Koper) provided his charismatic mark and scientific knowledge and his rich private and "Piran Library" were made available to me for years. Dear professors, I am especially grateful to you.

Both the study and specialist research stays abroad were financially enabled and/or supported by funds from different "patrons". These were grants obtained by the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports and the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia in the first place, then by the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and technology of the Republic of Slovenia and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) as well as the Rotary Club of Opatija. Finally, the printing of the book was supported by the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports of the Republic of Croatia and the Zagreb Municipal Office of Education, Culture and Sports. Hereby, I would like to thank all of them for their support since without them, nothing would be as it is.

In order for my research to be as complete and integral as possible, during my research trips, organized on my own initiative, I had the opportunity to see large quantities of archaeological finds, from "the Alps to the Adriatic and the Aegean", and of course to gather lots of literature, I was supported by numerous friends and colleagues: Blagoje Govedarica and Alexander Möser (Freie Universität, Institut für Prähistorische Archäologie, Berlin), Christoph Guthjar (Kulturpark Hengist, Wildon) and Georg Tiefengraber (Institut für südostalpine Bronze- und Eisenzeitforschung, Judenburg),

Studi di Milano, Milano), Nora Lucentini (Museo archeologico statale di Ascoli Piceno, Ascoli Piceno), Josipa Mandić (Università della Basilicata, Matera) i Nunzia Laura Saldalamacchia (Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck/Napoli), Andrej Gaspari (Ministrstvo za kulturo RS, Ljubljana), Marija Lubšina Tušek (Zavod za varstvo kulturne dediščine Slovenije, Center za preventivno arheologijo, Ptuj), Primož Pavlin (Inštitut za arheologijo ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana), Jana Puhar (Posavski muzej Brežice, Brežice), Brina Škvor Jernejčič i Peter Turk (Narodni muzej Slovenije, Ljubljana), Maja Bunčić (Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, Zagreb), Martina Čelhar (Sveučilište u Zadru, Zadar), Natalija Čondić (Arheološki muzej Zadar, Zadar), Damir Doračić (Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, Zagreb), Hrvoje Giaconi (Ministarstvo kulture RH, Gospić), Tonka Kružić (Pomorski i povijesni muzeja Hrvatskog primorja Rijeka, Rijeka), Daria Ložnjak Dizdar (Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb), Blaženka Ljubović (Gradski muzej Senj, Senj) i Lidija Miklik-Lozuk (Muzej Brodskog Posavlja, Slavonski Brod), Adnan Busuladžić (Zemaljski muzej BiH, Sarajevo), Aleksandar Jašarević (Muzej u Doboju, Doboju) i Andrijana Pravidur (Zemaljski muzej BiH, Sarajevo), Vojislav Filipović i Aleksandar Kapuran (Arheološki Institut, Beograd), Rastko Vasić (Beograd), Milena Vrzić (JU muzeji, galerija i biblioteka Budve, Budva), Antonio Jakimovski i Marjan Jovanov (Univerzitet Sv. Kiril i Metodij, Skopje), Strahil Temov i Zlatko Videski (Muzej na Makedonija, Skopje), Pasko Kuzman (Ohrid) te Anastassios Antonaras (Museum of Byzantine Culture, Thessaloniki). Isto tako, želim se iskreno zahvaliti i djelatnicima stručnih knjižnica posebno Bredi Pavčić Justin (Inštitut za arheologijo ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana), Urški Pajk (Narodni muzej Slovenije, Ljubljana) i Petru Čerčetu (Univerza na Primorskem, Inštitut za dediščino Sredozemlja, Koper).

Iznimno mjesto u ovoj opsežnoj "zahvalnici" pripada, razumljivo, mojoj obitelji. Ponajprije roditeljima i bratu koji me na mom "putu" neizmjereno i nesebično mnogo pomažu, bodreći me neprestano od svakog "prvog" i "ponovnog" trenutka. Vječni sam dužnik suprugu Borisu, jer je njegova ogromna i postojana podrška uvijek bila odlučujuća. Njegov provokativni duh podizao je razinu inspiracije, a njegova kritička misao, razboritost i trezvenost, toliko silno potrebne za svaki smisao ovog istraživanja. Našim "princeskama" Gali i Dori zahvalna sam za svu dobrotu, strpljenje i osmijeh kojeg dobivam svakoga dana i koji je bio snažna pobuda da "zgodbu" privedem do nekog, meni prihvatljivog, kraja. U smislu metafore malenog simbola, ali velikog značenja, koji nosi izraz moje beskrajne i iskrene zahvalnost, knjigu posvećujem upravo vama – *mojim najmilijima*.

Sa spoznajom kako je svaka nedosljednost ili pogreška u ovome djelu odgovornost isključivo i samo moja, vama, dragi čitatelju, želim ugodno i/ili korisno čitanje prošlosti koja pouzdano ima svoju dušu.

Nuccia Negroni Catacchio (Università degli Studi di Milano, Milano), Nora Lucentini (Museo archeologico statale di Ascoli Piceno, Ascoli Piceno), Josipa Mandić (Università della Basilicata, Matera) and Nunzia Laura Saldalamacchia (Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck/Napoli), Andrej Gaspari (Ministrstvo za kulturo RS, Ljubljana), Marija Lubšina Tušek (Zavod za varstvo kulturne dediščine Slovenije, Center za preventivno arheologijo, Ptuj), Primož Pavlin (Inštitut za arheologijo ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana), Jana Puhar (Posavski muzej Brežice, Brežice), Brina Škvor Jernejčič and Peter Turk (Narodni muzej Slovenije, Ljubljana), Maja Bunčić (Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, Zagreb), Martina Čelhar (Sveučilište u Zadru, Zadar), Natalija Čondić (Arheološki muzej Zadar, Zadar), Damir Doračić (Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, Zagreb), Hrvoje Giaconi (Ministarstvo kulture RH, Gospić), Tonka Kružić (Pomorski i povijesni muzeja Hrvatskog primorja Rijeka, Rijeka), Daria Ložnjak Dizdar (Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb), Blaženka Ljubović (Gradski muzej Senj, Senj) and Lidija Miklik-Lozuk (Muzej Brodskog Posavlja, Slavonski Brod), Adnan Busuladžić (Zemaljski muzej BiH, Sarajevo), Aleksandar Jašarević (Muzej u Doboju, Doboju) and Andrijana Pravidur (Zemaljski muzej BiH, Sarajevo), Vojislav Filipović and Aleksandar Kapuran (Arheološki Institut, Beograd), Rastko Vasić (Beograd), Milena Vrzić (JU muzeji, galerija i biblioteka Budve, Budva), Antonio Jakimovski and Marjan Jovanov (Univerzitet Sv. Kiril i Metodij, Skopje), Strahil Temov and Zlatko Videski (Muzej na Makedonija, Skopje), Pasko Kuzman (Ohrid) and Anastassios Antonaras (Museum of Byzantine Culture, Thessaloniki). In the same manner I would like to thank the employees of specialist libraries, in particular Breda Pavčić Justin (Inštitut za arheologijo ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana), Urška Pajk (Narodni muzej Slovenije, Ljubljana) and Peter Čerče (Univerza na Primorskem, Inštitut za dediščino Sredozemlja, Koper).

A special position in this extended "acknowledgement" belongs, understandably, to my family. First of all to my parents and brother who immensely and unselfishly supported me a lot on my "way", encouraging me constantly from every "first" and "repeated" moment. I will be forever indebted to my husband Boris, whose immense and stable support was always decisive. His provocative spirit boosted the level of inspiration and his critical thinking, sober-mindedness and temperance were necessary in every sense for this research. I am grateful to our "princesses" Gala and Dora for all their kindness, patience and for the smiles I get from them every day. They were a strong motivation to bring the "story" to an end, at least one that is acceptable to me. In the sense of the metaphor of a small symbol, but of an immense meaning, which has the expression of my endless and sincere gratefulness, it is to you – *my dearest ones* – that I dedicate this book. Being aware of the fact that every inconsistency or mistake in the present work is exclusively and only my responsibility, I wish you, dear readers, a pleasant and/or useful reading of the past which surely has its own soul.





## Prostorni obuhvat i prirodna obilježja Kvarnera

### Prostorni obuhvat

Karakteristična obilježja istočne obale Jadrana njegova su dužina i osobita razvedenost. Pitome uvale, pristupačni zaljevi, tisuću otoka, koji svojim nizom stvaraju zaštićene kanale i lagune, toplo more i blaga sredozemna klima pružili su osnovne uvjete za razvoj života i kontinuirano naseljavanje tog dijela obale. Zaklonjene uvale i lagune davale su sigurnu zaštitu i skloništa za nevremena, pa su tako pogodovale razvoju ustaljene plovidbe, a tijekom godina preuzeli su i važnu ulogu pomorsko-trgovačkih uporišta. Obala predstavlja sasvim poseban, odvojen morski pojas od onog otočnog bilo u reljefno-strukturalnom bilo u klimatskom obilježju. Pa ipak, zahvaljujući otočnim predispozicijama obala se, a s njom i gravitirajući unutrašnji prostori, povezuju sa širim sredozemnim bazenom.<sup>1</sup> Istovrsno, i otoci se, u geostrateškom i gospodarskom smislu, preko obale povezuju s neizostavno važnim priobalnim zaleđem. Tako izgrađen "most", formiran u izvrstan prirodni ekosustav, čini jedinstveni zemljopisni kompleks koji je omogućio život čovjeka i njegovo aktivno djelovanje u najrazličitijim razdobljima prošlosti, gotovo jednako kao i danas.

Područje Kvarnera ili kvarnersko primorje dio je sjevernog hrvatskog primorskog pojasa u čijoj cjelini i ekosustavu predstavlja vrlo značajnu i istaknutu poziciju. Na tom se zemljopisnom položaju Jadransko, putem njega i Sredozemno more, najviše uvlači u prostrani europski kopneni prostor.<sup>2</sup> To ujedno znači da se na tom položaju dodiruju i međusobno isprepliću dva potpuno različita zemljopisna miljea, jadransko-mediteranski i posavsko-podunavski (sl. 1).<sup>3</sup>

Kvarnerski priobalni pojas, s naglašenim Riječkim zaljevom, izdvojen je od zaleđa planinskim masivima, pa se polukružno prostire i izdvaja od okolnog priobalja. S istočne strane Velebit, sa zapadne Učka, odnosno rubne planine Gorskoga kotara na sjeveru i sjeveroistoku, omogućili su upravo takvo izdvajanje. U riječkom su zaleđu pitoma Kastavština i Grobniština, s prostranim Grobničkim poljem. Iznad Bakarskoga zaljeva proteže se krasičko-hreljinski plato i prema jugoistoku plodni Vinodol, na kojeg se nadovezuje strmivito pod-

<sup>1</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 63.

<sup>2</sup> Rogić 1982: 15; Stražičić 1996a: 38.

<sup>3</sup> Glogović 1989: 1-2; Stražičić 1996a: 38.

## Regional comprehension and natural characteristics of the Kvarner area

### Regional comprehension

The most typical characteristics of the Eastern Adriatic coast are its length and dismemberment. Easily accessible bays and thousands of islands, creating in their sequence secure channels and lagoons, a warm sea and the mild Mediterranean climate provided the basic conditions for cultural development and the continuous settling of this part of the coast. Shielded bays and lagoons offered protection and shelter in storms and allowed the development of navigation, taking over with the passing of time the role of naval and trade strongholds. The coastal belt on the other hand created a separate area, different from the islands in terms of relief, structure and climate. However, due to the predispositions of the islands, the coastal areas and its hinterlands were connected to the wider Mediterranean basin.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, the islands were in a geostrategic and economic way, via the coastal area, connected to the hinterlands. Such a "bridge" created an exceptional ecosystem and a unique geographical complex, which made the life of man possible as well as their active performance in the most various periods of the past as also today.

The area of Kvarner is a constituent part of the northern Croatian coastal belt and it occupies in its ecological system a very important and prominent position. It is in that area that the Adriatic Sea, and through it the Mediterranean, indents into the European continent.<sup>2</sup> This means that the Kvarner is the area where two completely different geographical spheres touch and interweave – the Adriatic Mediterranean and the Sava-Danube *milieu* (fig.1).<sup>3</sup>

The coastal belt of Kvarner, with the prominent Rijeka Bay, is divided from its hinterlands by mountainous chains creating a semi-circular area separated from the rest of the coast. The Velebit from the east, the Učka from the west, and the Gorski kotar border mountains on the north and north-east created this isolation. In the hinterland of Rijeka there are the tamed Katsavština and Grobniština with the spacious Grobnički field. Above the bay of Bakar there is the Krasica-Hreljin plateau, and to the south-east the fertile Vinodol on which the steep Podgorje of Velebit ascends. The low calcareous ridge is

<sup>1</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 63.

<sup>2</sup> Rogić 1982: 15; Stražičić 1996a: 38.

<sup>3</sup> Glogović 1989: 1-2; Stražičić 1996a: 38.



Slika 1. Kvarner i njegov položaj na prostoru sjevernog Jadrana.

Figure 1. Kvarner and its position on the territory of northern Adriatic.

velebitsko Podgorje. Niski vapnenački greben presijecaju Potok, Rječina, Draški potok, Bakarska vrata, Dubračina i Suha Ričina, Senjska i Borova Draga te Žrnovnica. U geoprometnoj povezanosti planinski su prijevoji Gorskoga kotara na najužem dijelu dinarske planinske barijere (Obruč, Tuhobić i dr.) dopustili povezanost, kroz tzv. Delnička vrata, sa srednjopodunavskim prostorom, odnosno s Panonijom na sjeveroistoku, te sa zapadnim balkanskim prostorom na jugoistoku. S druge strane, doline riječnih komunikacija Reke i Pivke, odnosno cerkničke kotline i postojnskih vrata, pružaju najlakši i najbrži prolaz u jugoistočnopredalpsko područje, preko kojeg se ostvaruje poveznica sve dalje sa srednjoeuropskim prostorom (sl. 1).<sup>4</sup>

Izuzet kopnenih značajki, posebnost kvarnerskog primorja čini jedinstvena otočna skupina koja se rasprostire od Riječkog zaljeva na sjeveru pa do ulaza u Kvarnerić, tj. do tzv. Ilovičkih ili Kvarnerskih vrata na krajnjem jugu, odnosno od Podvelebitskog kanala pa sve prema istočnoj obali Istre. Ona je raspoređen u dva niza otoka: zapadni s Cresom i Lošinjem, s manjim otocima Unije, Srakane i Susak, Ilovik i Sv. Petar te istočni s Krkom, Rabom i sjevernim dijelom otoka Paga, s nekoliko manjih otoka između njih (sl. 1; 2). Najveći su otoci Krk i Cres, svaki po 405,8 km<sup>2</sup>, ali za razliku od Krka koji je dvostruko širi, Cres je dvostruko duži. Vransko jezero na tome otoku, s razinom oko 13 m iznad mora, jedinstven je hidrografski fenomen na Jadranu te sadrži iznimno čiste pitke vode kojom se opskrbljuje gotovo cijeli otočni arhipelag. Otok Krk također ima dva mala jezera: Ponikve i Jezero, dok otok Rab ima

transacted by the streams of Potok, Rječina, Draški potok, Bakarska vrata, Dubračina and Suha Ričina, Senjska and Borova Draga as well as Žrnovnica. From the geostrategic perspectives the mountainous passes of Gorski kotar, on the lowest part of the Dinaric mountainous barrier (Obruč, Tuhobić and others), allowed the connection through Delnička vrata with the central Danubian area – with Pannonia on the north-east and western Balkan area on the south-east. On the other side, the river valleys of Reka and Pivka, and the basin of Cerknica and the Postojna "doors" enabled the easiest and fastest passage into the south-eastern Pre-alpine area, which was a connection to the central European area (fig. 1).<sup>4</sup>

Except for the coastal characteristics, the peculiarity of the Kvarner area is its unique islands archipelago stretching from the bay of Rijeka in the north all the way down to the entry into the Kvarnerić – till the doors of Ilovik or Kvarner in the south, or the Podvelebit channel and all the way to the Eastern coast of Istra. It is divided into two lines of islands – the western islands of Cres and Lošinj with the smaller islands of Unije, Srakane, Susak, Ilovik and Sv. Petar, and the eastern islands of Krk, Rab and the northern part of the island of Pag with several smaller islands between them (fig. 1; 2). The largest islands are Krk and Cres, each measuring 405.8 km<sup>2</sup>, but unlike Krk, which is two times broader, Cres is two times longer than Krk. The Vranje Lake on the island of Cres, which is 13 meters above the sea level, is a unique hydrographical phenomenon on the Adriatic that has stocks of clean drinking water that provides a supply for the whole island archipelago. The island of Krk also has two smaller lakes – Ponikve and Jezero, whereas the island of Rab has the largest number of springs ensuring thus a constant supply of drinking water throughout the year.<sup>5</sup>

The island group creates a wholesome and safe protection of the coast from the seaside. Still, the coastal area is easily accessible through channels between the islands, like e.g. the Vela, Srednja and Mala vrata. These passages enable a simple and easy control of navigation ways, whose direction determines the vertical communications of the coast with the open sea, and the horizontal communications in the coastal trade, as well as the connection of the Istrian peninsula with the eastern Podvelebit and the area of northern Dalmatia. Today, ferry lines indicate the points of shortest distance between the mainland and the islands – the islands of Cres and Lošinj are connected on the relation of Brestova and Porozina, the island of Rab on the relation of Jablanac and Mišnjak, whereas the island of Pag is connected on the relation of Przina and Žigljen (fig. 2). Today, only the island of Krk is connected to the mainland by a real bridge. However, it has always "behaved" like that by using the positions of the small island of Sv. Marko. This is why Krk is particularly important and enjoys a special traffic position in the Kvarner area. It is a focal point connecting the routes between Valbiska and Merang with Cres and Lošinj, and across Baška and Lopar with Rab, which further continues across Rab and Lun with the Island of Pag (fig. 2). Finally, the islands of Ilovik and Sv. Petar make a natural connection with the islands of northern Dalmatia – creating a connection between the northern and central Adriatic. These positions have always been equally important for connecting the coast with the islands and the islands among them (fig. 2).<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 38, 40-41.

<sup>4</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 38, 40-41.

<sup>5</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 38; Benac, Ružić, Žic 2006.

<sup>6</sup> Rogić 1975; Rogić 1982; comp. Stražičić 1996a: Stražičić 1997.

pak najviše izvora, koji tako zadovoljavaju i osiguravaju nepresušne izvore pitke vode tijekom cijele godine.<sup>5</sup>

Otočna se skupina pruža, dakle, u takvom slijedu da čini potpunu i sigurnu zaštitu obala s morske strane, a čijim se otočnim kanalima, a to su Vela, Srednja i Mala vrata, ipak lako može pristupiti obalnim stranama kopna. Pogodnost navedenih morskih prolaza je i ta što omogućavaju jednostavno i dobro kontroliranje plovnih putova. Njihov smjer pružanja određuje vertikalnu komunikaciju s kopna s otvorenim morem, ali isto tako međusobno horizontalno povezivanje u kabotaži, kao i spajanje istarskog poluotoka s istočnim podvelebitskim i dalje sa sjevernodalmatinskim prostorom. Danas trajektne veze ukazuju na najbliže dodirnice otoka s kopnom; otoci Cres i Lošinj spajaju se na relaciji Brestova-Porozina, otok Rab na relaciji Jablanac-Mišnjak, dok se otok Pag povezuje na relaciji Prizna-Žigljen (sl. 2). Jedino je otok Krk danas doista spojen pravim mostom, koji se, doduše, oduvijek tako i "ponašao" koristeći položaj preko otočića Sv. Marko. Zbog toga Krk ima posebnu važnost i prometnu poziciju na Kvarneru, čvrstu "točku" preko koje su dalje, relacijom Valbiska-Merag, spojeni iznova Cres i Lošinj, i podosta zanimljivu relaciju Baška-Lopar kojom se pridružuje otok Rab, a čija se logična daljnja komunikacija nastavlja relacijom Rab-Lun u pridruživanju otoka Paga (sl. 2). Napokon, otoci Ilovik i Sv. Petar predstavljaju prirodnu poveznicu s otocima sjeverne Dalmacije, pa je upravo to i prirodna relacija između sjevernog i srednjeg Jadrana. Ti su položaji oduvijek imali upravo isti značaj; premošćivanja, odnosno spajanja kopna s otocima, otoke s kopnom (sl. 2).<sup>6</sup>

## Karakter geološko-morfološke strukture reljefa

Geomorfološki, područje kvarnerskog bazena, i priobalnog i otočnog dijela, pripada dijelu Dinarida jer se priobalni reljefni oblik pruža uglavnom dinarskim smjerom u pravcu sjeverozapada. Ipak ima tu i izuzetaka, a koji se u prvom redu ističe smjerom pružanja masiva Učke i to u pravcu sjever-jug. Sama geomorfološka struktura reljefa oblikuje se tijekom posljednjih pet milijuna godina, od donjeg pliocena do danas. Zbog neotektonskih horizontalnih pokreta područje Riječkog zaljeva okrenuto je prema jugu i jugozapadu, a zbog vertikalnih pokreta potonulo je dno Čepićkog polja i Riječkog zaljeva te znatno izdignut masiv Učke. Vapnenačke stijene iz kredne su i paleogenske epohe, a područje od Učke do Riječkog zaljeva oblikovano je u karbonatnim stijenama (sl. 1). Tako geološku osnovu predstavljaju mezozojski vapnenci, od čijih su stijena načinjeni planinski masivi i uzvišenja, te dolomiti kredne starosti zastupljeni najčešće u udolinama. Pored takvih stijena javljaju se i uske izdužene zone paleogenog fliša.<sup>7</sup>

Osnovne naznake današnjeg reljefa započinju izdizanjem i izvišnjem dijelova reljefa pred sam kraj mlađeg tercijara. Dijelovi mladotercijarne zaravnjene površine, ponajprije vapnenački, relativno su dobro sačuvani osobito na dinarskom području. Reljefna struktura je, dakle, kamenita i vrlo strma, s brojnim depresijama; plodnim udolinama i ponikvama, vrtačama i dolcima. Kod dinarskog područja glavne tektonske linije, duž kojih se zbivaju pokreti, imaju smjer sjeverozapad, pa se i razvoj riječne mreže, odnosno erozivno udubljanje, prilagođavao tektonskim linijama.<sup>8</sup>



Slika 2. Zemljopisni razmještaj i međupovezanost kvarnerskog priobalnog s otočnim i međuotočnim područjima.

Figure 2. Geographical position of the Kvarner bay and major sites with marked positions of the shortest distances between the mainland and the islands.

## Geomorphological characteristics of the relief

Geomorphologically the area of the Kvarner basin, its islands and the costal part, belong to the Dinaric Mountains – and the costal relief is oriented in the same direction as the latter, mainly from north-west to the south-east. However, there are certain exceptions here, as for example the orientation of Učka going from north to the south. The geomorphological structure of the relief was formed in the last 5 million years – from the Lower Pliocene until today. Due to neotectonic horizontal movements, the bay of Rijeka is oriented towards the south and south-west, but due to the vertical movement a part of Čepićko polje and the bay of Rijeka were submerged, while the massive of Učka was lift. Limestone rocks were formed in the Cretaceous and Paleogene epochs, but the territory from Učka to the bay of Rijeka is made of carboniferous rocks (fig. 1). Its geological base is made of Mesozoic limestone, which form the mountain massifs and heights, whereas the dolomites of the Cretaceous age form the valleys. Besides them, also narrow and elongated strips of Palaeogene flysch were formed.<sup>7</sup>

The basic characteristics of the present relief were formed at the end of the Upper Tertiary, when the elevation process of some forma-

<sup>5</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 38; Benac, Ružić, Žic 2006.

<sup>6</sup> Rogić 1975; Rogić 1982; usp. Stražičić 1996a; Stražičić 1997.

<sup>7</sup> Č. Benac 1988: 24; Č. Benac 2001: 5-7; Stražičić 1996a: 38-40; Mihaljević 1998: 278-281.

<sup>8</sup> Rogić 1982: 20-22; Čaval 1983: 14-16; Č. Benac 2001: 5-7.

<sup>7</sup> Č. Benac 1988: 24; Č. Benac 2001: 5-7; Stražičić 1996a: 38-40; Mihaljević 1998: 278-281.

Međutim, prirodni pejzaž kakav danas poznajemo postupno se definira i oblikuje tijekom hocenskih promjena. Prije oko 10.000 godina nakon izmjene hladnih i toplijih intervala, došlo je do konačnog zatopljivanja i more je potopilo krški reljef dna kvarnerskog bazena, viša krška kamenita područja ostala su nepokrivena pa većinu obale izgrađuju razmjerno čvrste karbonatne stijene. Tada se formiraju osnovne odlike današnje obale i otoka, hidrografska mreža i današnji reljef, obilježen složenim procesima različitog oblikovanja padina i krških korozivskih procesa, nastanka holocenskih terasa, plavina i prostranih naplavnih ravnica.<sup>9</sup>

Reljefna struktura priobalnog dijela zaljeva posljedica je tektonskih procesa i prostornog rasporeda stijena različita sastava te utjecaja egzogenih faktora različita intenziteta što su djelovali u geološkoj prošlosti. Eroziji je pogodovala manja otpornost flišnih naslaga i karbonatskih stijena. Glavne su erozijske doline vezane za vapnenice, pa je vjerojatno da su i tektonski predisponirane. Upravo na takvoj vapnenačkoj podlozi strukturirale su se krške zaravni.<sup>10</sup> Flišne naslage očuvale su se jedino u Škurinjskoj dragi i u Kostreni. Budući da je vapnenac navučen i leži na vodopropusnim naslagama fliša, raspucan je i propustan te obiluje pećinama, jamama, vrtačama i kolektor je podzemnih voda.<sup>11</sup> No sa sjeveroistočne strane masiva pružaju se kontinuirane flišne zone i to u dolini Drage i u produžetku doline Rječine sve do Vinodola. Te nepropusne flišne podloge uvjetovale su da se održe dva jedina površinska trajnija vodotoka, Draški potok i Rječina. Najznačajnije flišne zone na otoku Krku nalaze se od Omišlja do Baške, na otoku Rabu od Kampora i Supetrasko Drage do Barbata. Na otocima Srakane, Unije na području Kurila na Lošinju i pogotovo na otoku Susku, očuvane su kvartarne naslage pijeska tipa prapora, u čijem smislu otok Susak iznova predstavlja fenomenološku pojavu (sl. 1; 2).<sup>12</sup>

Blagi pregibi na padinama obično imaju oblik zaravni s većim ili manjim ponikvama. Prekrivač tih površina je uglavnom crvenica smeđecrvene boje što je to karakteristika priobalnog područja od Opatije do Vinodola te sjevernog dijela otoka Cresa i Krka.<sup>13</sup> Grobničko polje karakteristično je pak s nataloženim pleistocenskim šljunčanim naslagama. Upravo su takvi geološko-morfološki reljefni uvjeti bili presudni za formiranje naselja i agrarnu valorizaciju prostora osobito značajnu u razdoblju prapovijesti. S reljefnom strukturom i geološkim sastavom uvjetovan je i izgled dolinskog reljefa, u propusnim vapnenačkim zonama, gdje su se mogle usjeći samo veće rijeke, doline imaju izgled uskih sutjeski s vertikalnim stranama.<sup>14</sup> Zavale, koje obuhvaćaju i nanosima pokrivene vapnenačke zaravni, svojim ravnim dnom i površinskim rijekama suprotstavljene su okolnom krškom reljefu. One predstavljaju polja u kršu koja će pogodovati razvoju življenja i na takvim nepristupačnim prostorima.<sup>15</sup> Nadalje, samo naplavno zemljište na ušću Rječine postojalo je već i u prapovijesnim razdobljima i stoga je korisno služilo zajednicama koje su ga baštinile. Zbog kretanja morskih struja riječni su se sedimenti taložili uz zapadnu obalu ušća, pa je stoga cijela zapadna obala grada Rijeke izrazito niska.<sup>16</sup> Ostali dijelovi obale stjenoviti su, ali također relativno niski i pristupačni. Istočni dio obale prema Kostreni strmiji je od zapadnog dijela, koji se proteže od Kantride do Preluka. Duž obale nala-

tions started. Parts of Upper Tertiary levelled surfaces, mostly made of limestone, are very well preserved – mostly in the Dinaric area. The relief structures are rocky and very steep with numerous depressions, fertile fields and sink holes. Along the Dinaric area, main tectonic lines along which the tectonic movements took place are oriented from north-west to south-east. Consequently, the evolution of fluvial networks and erosional processes were adapted to the orientation of these tectonic break lines.<sup>8</sup>

However, the landscape as we know it today was formed gradually during the changes in the Holocene. Some 10.000 years ago, after the swap of colder and warmer periods, the final warming took place and the sea flooded the characteristic bay of Kvarner, whereas the higher areas consisting of harder carboniferous rocks remained uncovered. Some of the basic characteristics of today's costal area and islands were formed then: the hydrographical network, today's relief dominated by erosional processes forming slopes and Holocene terraces and the alluvial fans and plains.<sup>9</sup>

The relief structure of the costal belt is a consequence of tectonic processes and spatial divisions of different types of rock formations – the erosion was favoured by the low solidity of flysch sediments and carboniferous rocks. Major erosional valleys were linked to limestone formations and were most probably tectonically predisposed. It was on such a limestone base that carstic fields were created.<sup>10</sup> Flysch sediments were preserved only in Škurinjska draga and Kostrena. Since limestone is found on the permeable layers of flysch, it is cracked and porous with numerous caves, abysses and sinkholes. It acts also as collector of underground waters.<sup>11</sup> However, on the north-eastern side of the massif, continuous zones of flysch stretch in the valleys of Draga and Rječina and all the way to Vinodol. These waterproof flysch bases created also the only two major surface watercourses – that of Draški potok and Rječina. The most important flysch zones on the island of Krk are located between Omišalj and Baška, and on Rab between Kampor and Supetarska draga to Barbat. Sediments of quaternary sandy light soils are found on the islands of Srakane, Unije, on the territory of Kurilo on the island of Lošinj, and in particular on the island of Susak, which is in that sense a geological phenomenon (fig. 1; 2).<sup>12</sup>

Gentle changes in relief on the sides of hills normally have the forms of plateaus with smaller or larger sinkholes - the covers of these areas mostly consist of red soil of a brownish-red colour, which is one of the main features of the costal belt stretching from Opatija to Vinodol and to the northern part of the islands of Cres and Krk.<sup>13</sup>

The field of Grobnik is typically filled with Pleistocene gravels. Exactly those geological and morphological features were decisive in the formation of a settlement with a strongly developed agrarian tradition during all historical periods. The relief structure and the geological composition dictated the appearance of valleys. In limestone zones, where only major rivers were able to cut through, valleys look like narrow gorges with vertical sides.<sup>14</sup> With their flat bottom and ground rivers, basins, including limestone flat lands covered with sediments, are contrasted to the surrounding carstic relief and represent the fields in the carst that will foster the development of life

<sup>9</sup> Rogić 1982: 22.

<sup>10</sup> Č. Benac 1988: 24.

<sup>11</sup> Č. Benac, Juračić 1998: 27-45; Mihaljević 1998: 277-302; Č. Benac 2001: 5-7

<sup>12</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 38, 40-41.

<sup>13</sup> Čaval 1983: 14-16; Č. Benac 1988: 24.

<sup>14</sup> Čaval 1983: 21-22; Č. Benac 1988: 24; Stražičić 1996a: 42.

<sup>15</sup> Rogić 1982: 20-25.

<sup>16</sup> Č. Benac 1988: 24.

<sup>8</sup> Rogić 1982: 20-22; Čaval 1983: 14-16; Č. Benac 2001: 5-7.

<sup>9</sup> Rogić 1982: 22.

<sup>10</sup> Č. Benac 1988: 24.

<sup>11</sup> Č. Benac-Juračić 1998: 27-45; Mihaljević 1998: 277-302; Č. Benac 2001: 5-7.

<sup>12</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 38, 40-41.

<sup>13</sup> Čaval 1983: 14-16; Č. Benac 1988: 24.

<sup>14</sup> Čaval 1983: 21-22; Č. Benac 1988: 24; Stražičić 1996a: 42.

ze se i stjenoviti oblici s obalnim "pećinama", pa se taj naziv prenio i u toponomastiku dijela grada koji nosi naziv *Pećine*. Stjenoviti obalni dijelovi na istoku i zapadu zaljeva, šljunkovite plaže i dobro očuvan vegetacijski pokrov uobličili su pejzaž obalnog reljefa.<sup>17</sup>

U razdoblju oko petog tisućljeća stare ere definira se izvorni izgled prirodnog pejzaža "geološke sadašnjice". Promjene koje su se događale s vegetacijskim pokrovom bile su svakako praćene promjenama u antropogeno-zoogenim utjecajima na prirodni pejzaž. Posljedice takvih djelovanja odrazile su se na osobine vegetacijskog pokrova. Započeo je proces mijenjanja primarnog ili prirodnog pejzaža u različite, društvenim utjecajima transformirane, tipove stvarnih zemljopisnih pejzaža.<sup>18</sup>

## Klimatske i ekološke osobine

Doticaj različitih zemljopisnih oblika Europe na tom dijelu primorske regije mnogo utječe na osobine vremena. Prema općoj cirkulaciji atmosfere u Europi, Kvarner se nalazi na vrlo dominantnom mjestu. Klimatske promjene su poradi toga raznolike, česte i znatne.<sup>19</sup> To je razmeđe između hladnih polarnih i toplih tropskih zračnih masa pa se one neprestano izmjenjuju. U zimskim razdobljima strujanje hladnog zraka iz kontinentalnog prostora, vrlo visokog pritiska koje zbog većeg hlađenja nastaje na istoku, prema toplijem Atlantiku preko tih prostora ima veliko značenje za meteorološko vrijeme.<sup>20</sup> Suprotna se situacija dešava ljeti kada zbog jačeg zagrijavanja kopna, osobito s Bliskog istoka, zrak struji iz hladnije azorske anticiklone prema Bliskom istoku. Promjene položaja središta djelovanja tijekom godine uzrokuju različite izmjene zračnih struja, prema tome i različite tipove morskih strujanja te različite tipove vremena. Međutim, značenje reljefa bitno je i za kretanje zračnih struja, jer se one mijenjaju prilikom njihova izdizanja i spuštanja preko planina što svakako utječe i na razvoj vremena.<sup>21</sup> Tako je zapravo prirodna reljefna granica između primorske i planinske klime na području šire riječke regije na Gornjem Jelenju.<sup>22</sup>

Od Istre i Kvarnera pa sve prema prostranijem jugoistočnom primorskom pojasu prostire se pravi sredozemni klimatsko-ekološki prostor (sl. 1). Ljeta su prema temperaturi vruća i malo se razlikuju po pojedinim zemljopisnim zonama obalnog pojasa. Bura, kao hladan i suh vjetar uglavnom sjeveroistočnog smjera, i jugo, kao vlažan topli vjetar, utječu na vremenske promjene zimi. Ljetna mediteranska klima uglavnom je topla i suha.<sup>23</sup> To je pak posljedica velike učestalosti anticiklonalnih tipova vremena koji tada obično prevladavaju. Ciklonalni poremećaji su puno rjeđi, a ako i dođe do kakvih prodora kontinentalnog zraka iz zaleđa, ne dolazi do znatnijeg smanjenja temperature. Međutim, često se dešava da se taj hladni zrak prilikom spuštanja na ugrišanu jadransku zavalu prilično ugrije, pa se smanjuje relativna vlaga, a posljedica tome je još veća suhoća. Najtopliji dijelovi pri tom nisu ni na obali, ni na otocima, nego u niskim zavalama odvojenim od mora.<sup>24</sup> Kako se uglavnom radi o vapnenačkom tlu, najveći dio oborinske vode nestaje u podzemlju.<sup>25</sup> Ljetne slabe i rijetke kiše zbog toga imaju neznatno djelovanje, a oskudica vlage u tlu i u zraku najizrazitije

even in such unapproachable areas.<sup>15</sup> In addition, the very alluvial area on the mouth of Rječina existed already in prehistory and was used by local communities. As a consequence of sea currents, river sediments were deposited on the western side of the mouth, which is why today's western side of the city of Rijeka is extremely low.<sup>16</sup> The rest of the coast is rocky, but relatively low and easily accessible – only the eastern part towards Kostrena is steeper than the western part, which stretches from Kantrida to Preluk. Along the coast there are dismembered parts with rocky formations, the so called coastal "pećine", after which this part of the city was named *Pećine*. Rocky coastal areas on the eastern and western side of the gulf, gravel beaches and a well-preserved vegetation cover, shaped the appearance of the costal belt.<sup>17</sup>

It was in the period of the 5<sup>th</sup> millennium BC that the original appearance of the natural landscape, known as the "geological present", was formed. Changes which influenced the vegetation cover were accompanied by antropogenuous and zoogenuous influences. The consequences of such activities are visible on the vegetation cover. As a consequence of social influences, the changing process of the primary, or natural, landscape into different types of real geographical landscapes has started.<sup>18</sup>

## Climatic and ecological characteristics of the region

Contacts between different European geographical regions significantly affect the ecology of the Kvarner Gulf. With respect to the atmospheric circulation, the Kvarner Gulf is located on a dominant position and thus climatic changes are heterogeneous, frequent and intensive.<sup>19</sup> This area is located on the separation line between cold polar and warm tropical air masses, which keep exchanging all the time. In winter time the streaming of cold air from the continental area of very high pressure, caused in the east by the cold, towards the warmer Atlantic is of major importance to the weather.<sup>20</sup> Quite the opposite takes place in the summer, when as a result of a stronger warming of the mainland, mostly from the Near East, the air streams from the colder Azorean anticyclone towards the Near East. Changes in the position of the centre of activity throughout the year cause various changes in the air currents, and accordingly also various types of sea currents and various types of weather. It is also the relief which affects the moving of air masses and changes of weather, since they change during their elevation and dropping over the mountains.<sup>21</sup> In this way, a natural border between the Mediterranean and the mountain climates is found in the broader region of Rijeka near Gornje Jelenje.<sup>22</sup>

From Istria to Kvarner and all the way to the vast south-eastern costal belt a true Mediterranean climatic and ecological area stretches (fig. 1). The summers are hot and minimal differences in temperature can be observed in different locations of the same ecological belt. *Bora*, the cold and dry wind mostly coming from north-east, and *jugo*, the warm and moist wind, affect the weather in the winter. During the summer the Mediterranean climate is mostly warm and dry,<sup>23</sup> which

<sup>17</sup> Č. Benac 1988: 25.

<sup>18</sup> Rogić 1982: 51-55.

<sup>19</sup> Gajić-Čapka et al. 1998: 159-161.

<sup>20</sup> Rogić 1982: 27-28; Čaval 1983: 16; Gajić-Čapka et al. 1998: 160-161.

<sup>21</sup> Rogić 1982: 28-30.

<sup>22</sup> Čaval 1983: 16, 18-19.

<sup>23</sup> Gajić-Čapka et al. 1998: 163.

<sup>24</sup> Gajić-Čapka et al. 1998: 162-164.

<sup>25</sup> Rogić 1982: 29-31; Čaval 1983: 17-18; Č. Benac 2001: 5-7.

<sup>15</sup> Rogić 1982: 20-25.

<sup>16</sup> Č. Benac 1988: 24.

<sup>17</sup> Č. Benac 1988: 25.

<sup>18</sup> Rogić 1982: 51-55.

<sup>19</sup> Gajić-Čapka et al. 1998: 159-161.

<sup>20</sup> Rogić 1982: 27-28; Čaval 1983: 16; Gajić-Čapka et al. 1998: 160-161.

<sup>21</sup> Rogić 1982: 28-30.

<sup>22</sup> Čaval 1983: 16, 18-19.

<sup>23</sup> Gajić-Čapka et al. 1998: 163.

su obilježje klime ovog, ali i gotovo cijelog jadransko-sredozemnog kruga.

Takva sredozemna klima utječe na svojstva tla, odnosno izravno na sastav i karakteristike vegetacijskog pokrova. Osnovne tipove zemljišta koji nastaju na staroj pleistocenskoj podlozi obrastaju šumske vegetacijske zajednice kao životna sredina životinjskog svijeta prilagođenog novim uvjetima prirodne sredine. Tako su najrašireniji tipovi tla crvenica i smeđa tla, tj. tla s oskudnim količinama organogenih materija (humusa) u slabije razvijenom gornjem sloju.<sup>26</sup> Crvenica, teško glinovito zemljište, je neotopljeni nekarbonatni ostatak vapnenačke podloge. Zbog prevladavajuće koncentracije željeznih oksida i aluminija ima tako karakterističnu boju.<sup>27</sup> Veliki dio preživjelih crvenica pod utjecajem manje tople i manje suhe klime pretvoren je ili se postupno pretvara u smeđa zemljišta. Ta zemljišta imaju nešto više humusa nego prave crvenice te pod utjecajem klime i tla na flišnoj podlozi dobivaju osobine smeđih tipova. Vegetacijski pokrov sredozemnog klimatskog areala obilježen je prilagodbom na suhoću ljetne polovice godine, pa su pretežno zastupljene zimzelene sredozemne zajednice.

Razvili su se i raznovrsni oblici šikarastih, vegetacijskih formacija. Za sve se sredozemne šikaraste površine navedenog kraja obično koristi termin *makija*, koji izvorno obilježava sredozemne šikare na silikatnim stijinama, jer drugi termin *garig* obilježava te iste šikare ali na vapnenačkim, kraškim zemljištima.<sup>28</sup> Zbog karaktera prijelazne zone razvila se submediteranska vegetacija koju ponajviše obilježava listopadna šuma hrasta medunca, kao i bijelog i crnog graba te jasena s nizom otpornijih zimzelenih sredozemnih biljaka.<sup>29</sup> Procesima degradacije submediteranskog prostora nastali su posebni oblici šikara, a njihovom su daljnjom degradacijom nastali najrasprostranjeniji tipovi submediteranskih kamenjara. U tu zonu spadaju sjeverni dio Cresa te gotovo čitav otok Krk, dok veći dio Cresa, otoci Rab, Lošinj i drugi manji otoci, pripadaju eumediteranskom prostoru i njihovoj vegetaciji.

Osim prirodne vegetacije i bilja, značajno je i kultivirano bilje, tj. sve vrste povrća koje su podnosile nedostatak vode, a u prošlosti su se uspješno uzgajale i žitarice (ječam, pšenica, zob). Jednako tako podložno uspijevaju i različite vrste voćaka od kojih su mnoge i samonikle biljke. Neizostavne su, dakako, vinova loza i maslina koje su se, sve donedavno, pružale na gotovo svim blažim i sunčanijim padinama Kvarnera.

Povezano s klimom i vegetacijom, treba spomenuti i svijet faune. Životinjske vrste kulturnog tipa, važne za egzistenciju populacija na tim prostorima zastupljene su uobičajenim tipovima, kao što su ovca, koza, konj, govedo i svinja.<sup>30</sup> Međutim, divljač je raznovrsnije zastupljena kako visokim tako i niskim tipovima, primjerice vuk, srna, jelen, divlja svinja ili zec, lisica, kuna, jazavac te posebno puh.<sup>31</sup> Dakako, značajne su i razne vrste ptica, poput prepelice, fazana ili tetrijeba, ali i razne vrste riječnih i morskih riba. Većina se od spomenutih vrsta i danas susreće na tim područjima, a u prapovijesno su vrijeme činile osnovne tipove proteinske prehrane. Od divljači treba još navesti smeđeg medvjeda i risa, koji su, sada, gotovo istrijebljeni.

To su okosnice zemljopisnog obuhvata i prirodnih obilježja Kvar-

is a consequence of the high occurrence of anticyclone types of weather, which dominate in that period of the year. Cyclonic disturbances are more rarely present, and, if breakthroughs of continental air from the hinterland take place, they do not cause a dramatic change of temperature. However, often cold air often gets warmer while landing on the hot Adriatic coast, decreasing thus the relative moisture, which consequently causes an even bigger drought. The warmest parts are neither on the coast nor on the islands, but rather in low bays separated from the sea.<sup>24</sup> Since the surrounding is of limestone rocks, the largest part of rainfall disappears immediately into the subsoil.<sup>25</sup> Weak and rare summer rains have thus an insignificant role, whereas the shortage of humidity in the ground and in the air is one of the major characteristics of this area, but also of the whole Adriatic and Mediterranean area.

In this way, the Mediterranean climate affects the characteristics of the soil, i.e. it has a direct impact on the composition and the peculiarities of the vegetation cover. Basic types of soils are created on an old Pleistocene base and form the habitat for different vegetation communities. Most frequent types of soils are red and brown soils – the soils with a low level of organogenous material (humus) in the less developed upper layer.<sup>26</sup> The red soils, heavy clayish land, are unmelted remains of the limestone base. Due to the dominant concentrations of iron oxides it has such a typical colour.<sup>27</sup> The largest part of red soils is transforming under the influence of a less warm and less dry climate into brown soils. Those lands have more humus than real red soils and as a consequence of the climate and the geological base made of flysch, they display the features of brown types of soils. The vegetation cover of the Mediterranean climatic area is marked by the adaptation to the drought during the half year of summer, so that the most frequent type of vegetation are evergreen Mediterranean communities.

Different forms of shrubby vegetational formations developed. For all of them the local name *makija* is used. Originally, this term designates a type of shrubby formation growing on silicate rocks, since the term *garig* is used to describe the same vegetation growing on limestone carstic grounds.<sup>28</sup> Due to the transitional character of the area, sub-Mediterranean vegetation developed dominated by forests of oak trees, white and black beeches and ash trees mixed with evergreen Mediterranean species.<sup>29</sup> With the processes of degradation of the sub-Mediterranean area, specific forms of scrubby vegetation covers were formed, which were transformed -due to further degradation- into a sub-Mediterranean rocky landscape. The northern part of the island of Cres should be included into this category, as well as almost whole island of Krk. On the other hand, the larger part of the islands of Cres, Rab, Lošinj and several smaller ones should be included into the eumediteranean zone and its vegetation.

Apart from the natural vegetation, also cultivated plants play an important role in the formation of the landscape. These are mostly species of vegetables that tolerate the lack of water, although, in the past also cereals were successfully grown (barley, wheat, rye). Also fruits are successfully grown, many of which grow wild. In this context it is not possible not to mention vine and olive trees which spread, until recently, on almost all gentle and sunny slopes of the Kvarner.

Connected to the climate and vegetation, also the fauna of the area

<sup>26</sup> Č. Benac 1988.

<sup>27</sup> Čaval 1983: 23-24.

<sup>28</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 45.

<sup>29</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 42.

<sup>30</sup> Čaval 1983: 28.

<sup>31</sup> Marchesetti 1903: 138; Marjanović 1981: 34.

<sup>24</sup> Gajić-Čapka et al. 1998: 162-164.

<sup>25</sup> Rogić 1982: 29-31; Čaval 1983: 17-18; Č. Benac 2001: 5-7.

<sup>26</sup> Č. Benac 1988.

<sup>27</sup> Čaval 1983: 23-24.

<sup>28</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 45.

<sup>29</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 42.

nera, koji je vrijednošću takvog zemljopisnog smještaja stvorio geostratešku, odnosno geoprometnu izuzetno važnu ulogu u okviru koridora sjevernoga Jadrana i nedjeljivo mu povezanoga zaleđa. Prolaz 45. usporednice, tj. sunčanika sjevernije od Cresa i Baške, pa točno kroz Senj, izuzev zemljopisnih, sugerira upravo na izuzetno povoljne klimatske uvjete, kao i na sve daljnje pozitivne posljedice koje su se odražavale u društvenom, gospodarskom i, naravno, kulturnom razvoju čitave regije.<sup>32</sup>

should be presented. Domesticated species, which were important for the existence of human populations, were limited to common ones such as sheep, goats, horses, cattle and swine.<sup>30</sup> However, game is more heterogeneously represented with large and small animals such as wolf, deer, roe deer, wild boar, rabbit, fox, marten, badger and dormouse.<sup>31</sup> When talking about the past, one should also add the brown bear and the lynx, which are almost exterminated today, but were frequent in the past. Of course, important are also different species of birds, such as quails and pheasants as well as different species of river and sea fish. The majority of these species is present today in the area, and we can assume that the situation was much the same in the past, when they represented the base of the protein diet of pre-historic populations.

This is only the framework of the geographical description and the natural characteristics of the Kvarner area. Based on its geographic setting, it has created an important geostrategic and communicational position within the framework of the northern Adriatic corridor and its connection to the hinterland. The passing of the 45<sup>th</sup> parallel of latitude, going a little to the north of Cres and Baška and passing straight through Senj, points at a combination of very favourable climatic conditions, which had a positive impact on the social, economic and cultural development of the whole region.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 38; Blečić 2007c.

<sup>30</sup> Čaval 1983: 28.

<sup>31</sup> Marchesetti 1903: 138; Marjanović 1981: 34.

<sup>32</sup> Stražičić 1996a: 38; Blečić 2007c.





## Nalazišta i pregled povijesti njihova istraživanja

Istraživanja prapovijesnih nalazišta na području Kvarnera provode se još od 19. stoljeća, gotovo u jednakoj mjeri na priobalnom i na otočnom dijelu. Iz tog vremena datira najveći dio građe koji je prikupljen iz nekropola i tumula, te samo manjim dijelom iz naselja, a obrađen je i iznova vrednovan ovim istraživanjem. Podaci o tadašnjim djelatnostima dostupni su uglavnom za iskopavanja u Osoru na otoku Cresu, zatim za Garicu, Šulu i Bašku na otoku Krku, Kastav, Tribalj-Grižane, Sv. Juraj i Klačenicu (sl. 2; 4; 7; 8; 15).

Kronološki, na području priobalja prva zapažanja i bilješke, koje se mogu smatrati arheološkog karaktera bilježi još J. W. Valvasor u 17. stoljeću. Autor je, naime, opisao predjele i prepoznatljive osobine kulturne baštine Rijeke, Grobnika, Kastva, Učke te ostalih manjih mjesta na kvarnerskoj obali i otocima koja su prema njegovoj procjeni bila značajan oblik prepoznavanja i vrednovanja cijelog tog prostora.<sup>33</sup> Posebnu je pozornost usmjerio na tzv. *arheološke pojave* na Kastvu, kojima je podrazumijevao npr. ukop *rimskog ratnika* ili postojanje tzv. "*grčkih zdenaca*", upotrebljavanih, navodno, do autorovih dana.

Vrijedni su i prvi zapisi o kulturnoj baštini, rimskim ostacima, mit-skim legendama i sl. Alberta Fortisa koji se u svojoj studiji *Saggio d'osrevrazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Ossero* iscrpno pozabavio prošlošću otoka Cresa i Osora (sl. 4).<sup>34</sup> Međutim, zanimljive je podatke pružio i za druge kvarnerske otoke, naročito Krk i podvelebitski kanal u kapitalnom i dalje aktualnom djelu *Put po Dalmaciji* iz 1774. godine.<sup>35</sup>

Obimom najveća i datumom najstarija istraživanja poznata su iz Osora (sl. 4), gradića na najnižoj i najužoj prevlaci koja razdvaja, nekad jedinstvene, otoke Cres i Lošinj.<sup>36</sup> Ondje se sustavno iskopavalo prapovijesnu i rimsku nekropolu na Kavaneli, na lošinjskoj strani prokopanog morskog kanala, ali i na cijelom području urbane jezgre, još od 1860. godine. Mnoštvo je građe, koju je prikupljao nadžupnik vlč. Ivan Kvirin Bolmarčić, najvećim dijelom rimskodobne, objavljivano u tadašnjim glasilima *Mittheilungen der KK-Central Commission* i *Archeologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Österreich*, a manji dio nalaza i opise samog nalazišta i mjesta

<sup>33</sup> Valvasor 1689: 3/51.

<sup>34</sup> Fortis 1771.

<sup>35</sup> Fortis 2004: 217-288.

<sup>36</sup> Blečić 2007b.

## The sites and the history of their research

The research of prehistoric sites on the territory of Kvarner started in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and were carried out almost equally on the islands and on the costal part. The majority of finds, originated from necropoles and tumuli, with only a minor part from settlements, is from that period and has been analysed and re-evaluated in the present work. The data concerning the activities of that time are available mainly from excavations at Osor on the Island of Cres, from Garica, Šula and Baška on the island of Krk and Kastav, Tribalj-Grižane, Sv. Juraj and Klačenica on the costal belt (fig. 2; 4; 7; 8; 15).

Chronologically, the first observations and notations, which might be considered archaeological, were written in the 17<sup>th</sup> century by J. W. Valvasor. In his work, he described the territory and recognizable traits of the cultural heritage of Rijeka, Grobnik, Kastav, Učka and several smaller towns on the coastal area and the islands which were, according to his estimation, a significant form of recognition and evaluation of this area.<sup>33</sup> He paid special attention to so called "archaeological features" on Kastav, where, according to his words, the burial of a Roman warrior was discovered and the existence of "Greek wells" allegedly in use until the author's time.

Valuable are also the notes on cultural heritage, roman remains, mythological legends and other notes by Alberto Fortis, whose book *Saggio d'osrevrazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Ossero* describes in detail the past of the islands of Cres and Osor (fig. 4).<sup>34</sup> In his major and still topical work *Put po Dalmaciji* written in 1774 Fortis mentioned valuable information about other islands, in particular of Krk and Podvelebit channel.<sup>35</sup>

The first large-scale and also the earliest excavations were conducted in Osor (fig. 4), in the small town located on the lowest and narrowest strait dividing the once connected islands of Cres and Lošinj.<sup>36</sup> There, since the 1860s systematic excavations were conducted on the prehistoric and Roman cemetery on Kavanela on the Lošinj side of the channel and in the center of the town. Numerous finds, mostly from the Roman period, which were collected by the parish priest Ivan Kvirin Bolmarčić, were published in the scientific literature of the time – mainly in *Mittheilungen der K. und K. Central Commission* and *Archeologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Österreich*. Some finds and minor descriptions of the site itself were published by

<sup>33</sup> Valvasor 1689: 3/51.

<sup>34</sup> Fortis 1771.

<sup>35</sup> Fortis 2004: 217-288.

<sup>36</sup> Blečić 2007b.



Slika 3. Otto von Benndorf.

Figure 3. Otto von Benndorf.

pružili su Richard Burton,<sup>37</sup> Eduard von Sacken,<sup>38</sup> Otto von Benndorf (sl. 3)<sup>39</sup> i Anton Ritter Klodič.<sup>40</sup> Budući da je austrijsko Ministarstvo djelomično financijski potpomagalo istraživanja Bolmarčića, Otto von Benndorf, osnivač austrijskog arheološkog instituta, i osobno izrazito zainteresiran za nalazište na Osoru, nekoliko je dana bio u nadzoru tih radova, što je u detaljnom izvještaju uskoro i objavio. Ondje je naveo, između ostalog, opise različitih tipova i načina sahranjivanja na Kavaneli, zatim usredotočio se na nalaze iz rimskog doba, ali je obavijestio i o pojedinim, vrlo zanimljivim prapovijesnim predmetima. Potom, Klodič pak objavljuje, među inima, i nekoliko predmeta iz brončanog i željeznog doba<sup>41</sup> koji, međutim, struci ostaju uglavnom nepoznati ili ignorirani!<sup>42</sup> Iskopavanja I. Bolmarčića bila su nestručna i metodološki neadekvatno dokumentirana. Provodila su se od 1874. do 1880. godine, pa svi oni istraživači koji su se osorske građe dotaknuli, pogledali zbirku ili njegove dnevnik iskopavanja, svjedoče kako je iskopao nevjerojatnu količinu različitih i izrazito loše očuvanih, polomljenih, predmeta među kojima se posebno ističu jantarni ukrasi. Dokumentacija o građi, načinu

<sup>37</sup> Burton 1877.

<sup>38</sup> Sacken 1879: 150.

<sup>39</sup> Benndorf 1880: 73-82.

<sup>40</sup> Klodič 1885: I-VII.

<sup>41</sup> Klodič 1885: Fig. 1; 4-5; 13-14; 16.

<sup>42</sup> Tako se navedenih autora, odnosno od njih navedenih podataka i publicirane građe, nikada ne dotiče, a prilikom težnje cjelovitijeg prikaza istraživanja prapovijesti na otocima Cresu i Lošinju, Jasminka Ćus-Rukonić, koja uostalom i tri puta objavljuje identičan pregled (Ćus-Rukonić 1982; Ćus-Rukonić 1998; Ćus-Rukonić 2005). Također, u objavi samih predmeta iz kavanelanske nekropole ne navode se upravo ti stari, odnosno prvi put objelodanjeni predmeti materijalne kulture, što stvara znanstveni privid o njihovom publiciranju i interpretiranju (Ćus-Rukonić 1981; Glogović 1982b; Glogović 1987; posebno Glogović 1989; Glogović 2003; te Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989).

Richard Burton,<sup>37</sup> Eduard von Sacken,<sup>38</sup> Otto von Benndorf (sl. 3)<sup>39</sup> and Anton Ritter Klodič.<sup>40</sup>

Since the Austrian ministry partly provided financial support to Bolmarčić, Otto von Benndorf, founder of the Austrian Archaeological Institute, expressed his personal interest in the finds from Osor and personally supervised the excavations for a few days. Soon afterwards he published a detailed report in which he described, among other things, the different types and manners of burials on Kavanela. Although he focused on Roman finds, he mentioned also individual very interesting prehistoric finds. Soon afterwards, Klodič also published several Bronze and Iron Age artefacts.<sup>41</sup> Unfortunately, these finds were later mostly ignored by the scientific community or remained totally unknown.<sup>42</sup> However, the excavations by I. Bolmarčić, conducted between 1874 and 1880, were not professional even according to the standards of his time, and they were methodologically inappropriately documented. All the later researchers, that gained insight into his diaries and collections, noted that he excavated a large quantity of "extremely badly preserved" and broken artefacts, among which one should especially mention the pieces made of amber. His descriptions of the finds, his excavations and the graves themselves were more than modest.<sup>43</sup> However, after his departure to Krk, conservator S. Petris resumed the excavations in 1894 and in 1897. Results and description of his finds were also published in the Austrian news of the K. und K. Kommission.<sup>44</sup> Still, contrary to previous publications, his reports were extremely short, mostly just sketches. In a general overview of 1896 entitled *Aus Liburnien und Istrien* Edward Nowotny and Piero Sticotti also published several finds.<sup>45</sup>

As indicated by the sources of the period, Osor was definitely the richest archaeological site of the northern Adriatic (fig. 4) and several museums were eager to gain its treasures – the Archaeological Museum in Pula, which was in the process of being established, but also the museums of Rijeka and Zagreb. However, the finds still remained in Osor, mostly thanks to the museum established in the city hall in 1889, which exhibited prehistoric and Roman finds.<sup>46</sup>

Besides Osor, the second and most important site on Cres was definitely Beli (*Caput Insulae*) on the most northern part of the island directed towards Krk. From there, already since A. Fortis' times, Roman inscriptions and individual artefacts were known, but unfortunately they were mostly taken to Venice.<sup>47</sup> We can assume that Beli was an important hill fort settlement with its important infrastructure and an extensive necropolis below the town. The owner of the land excavated the necropolis, but only individual artefacts were collected from citizens at the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century by rvd. M. Mužina and sent by Ivan Milčetić to the National Museum in Zagreb.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Burton 1877.

<sup>38</sup> Sacken 1879: 150.

<sup>39</sup> Benndorf 1880: 73-82.

<sup>40</sup> Klodič 1885: I-VII.

<sup>41</sup> Klodič 1885: Fig. 1; 4-5; 13-14; 16.

<sup>42</sup> The authors and the data presented by them were never mentioned. In an attempt to provide an overall presentation of the prehistoric research on the islands of Cres and Lošinj, Jasminka Ćus-Rukonić, who published the same overview even three times, (Ćus-Rukonić 1982; Ćus-Rukonić 1998; Ćus-Rukonić 2005) also fails to mention exactly those old, i.e. first-time discovered artefacts of material culture in the very publications of finds from the Kavanela necropolis, which creates a scientific illusion of their publication and interpretation (Ćus-Rukonić 1981; Glogović 1982b; Glogović 1987; especially Glogović 1989; Glogović 2003; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989).

<sup>43</sup> Benndorf 1880: 150; Milčetić 1884: 83-85; Marchesetti 1924: 140-141.

<sup>44</sup> Petris 1895; Petris 1897.

<sup>45</sup> Nowotny, Sticotti 1896: 176.

<sup>46</sup> Milčetić 1884: 84-85.

<sup>47</sup> Fortis 1771: 39-70; Milčetić 1884: 80-81.

<sup>48</sup> Milčetić 1884: 80-82; Crnić 1886: 66-72.



**Slika 4.** Ortofotografija Osora s ucrtanim pružanjem gradskog bedema (→) i položajem prapovijesnih nekropola (▲) i grobova (●).

**Figure 4.** Orthophoto of Osora, with marked location of prehistoric city walls (→) and with indicated locations of prehistoric cemeteries (▲) and individual graves (●).

kopanja ili o samim grobovima i njihovim cjelinama bila je i više nego skromna.<sup>43</sup> Na iskopavanja I. Bolmarčića ubrzo se, nakon njegova odlaska u Krk, nadovezao i konzervator S. Petris, 1894. i 1897. godine. Rezultate svojih radova, istraživanja i popise građe također je objavio u istom austrijskom glasilu KK Komisije.<sup>44</sup> No za razliku od prijašnjih objava, Petrisovi su radovi doista bili isključivo u obliku kratkih izvješća, tj. crtica. U preglednom radu iz 1896. godine *Aus Liburnien und Istrien* nekoliko nalaza materijalne građe objavio je Edward Nowotny i Piero Sticotti.<sup>45</sup>

Kako kazuju sačuvani nam izvori iz toga vremena, Osora je tada neupitno najbogatije nalazište na sjevernom Jadranu (sl. 4), čije se građe žele domoći kako pulski arheološki muzej u osnivanju, tako upravo i riječki i zagrebački muzeji. No građa je ipak ostala u Osoru zahvaljujući čemu je uskoro otvoren u gradskoj vijećnici i Muzej s postavom prapovijesne i rimske građe, 1889. godine.<sup>46</sup>

Pored Osora, drugi i najvažniji lokalitet s Cresa, svakako je Beli (*Caput Insulae*) na krajnjem sjevernom dijelu otoka na istočnoj strani prema Krku. Iz Belog su također još od A. Fortisa bili poznati rimskodobni natpisi i pojedini predmeti, koji su uglavnom odneseni u Veneciju.<sup>47</sup> Pretpostavlja se kako je Beli bio značajno i vrlo važno gradinsko naselje sa svom važnijom infrastrukturom i

Other sites on the island of Cres (fig. 2), as for example the large tumulus below the hill fort Pukonjina near Loznati, and also several other smaller tumuli, which included only sparse finds or no finds at all, were excavated by conservator S. Petris at that time.<sup>49</sup> Only the excavation of a settlement was conducted by mayor Dr. J. Petris and Dr. N. Lemesich from Cres on the hill fort of St. Bartolomej above Merag. A part of the documentation and the finds was published by Ivan Mitis.<sup>50</sup> Except for some bracelets with a roof-shaped cross section, the collected finds were not published.

At the time of the Osora excavations, also the first scientific and test excavations started on the coastal part of the Kvarner area. From Grobnik to Bakar, Vinodol and further south to Sv. Juraj and Jablanac (fig. 2; 7; 15) – on the part of the coast under the inheritance of the National Museum in Zagreb (AMZ), from 1873 on research was conducted by Šime Ljubić, the museum director in that period (fig. 5). He devoted a lot of time in 1873 and 1874 to the systematic excavations of three tumuli on Garica on the north-eastern fertile part of the island of Krk.<sup>51</sup> There, he recorded and later published interesting Bronze Age finds coming from cremation burials of the two tumuli he excavated by himself.<sup>52</sup>

In the preceding year, another tumulus was excavated by the museum's commissioner, the parish priest from Vrbnik, rvd. Zahija who

<sup>43</sup> Benndorf 1880: 150; Milčetić 1884: 83-85; Marchesetti 1924: 140-141.

<sup>44</sup> Petris 1895; Petris 1897.

<sup>45</sup> Nowotny, Sticotti 1896: 176.

<sup>46</sup> Milčetić 1884: 84-85.

<sup>47</sup> Fortis 1771: 39-70; Milčetić 1884: 80-81.

<sup>49</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 127-128; Batović 2003: 255.


<sup>50</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 129-130; Batović 2003: 255.

<sup>51</sup> Ljubić 1876; Ljubić 1881; Ljubić 1889.

<sup>52</sup> Ljubić 1876: 8-10; Ljubić 1881: 9-10; Ljubić 1889: 165, 179.



Slika 5. Šime Ljubić.  
Figure 5. Šime Ljubić.



Slika 6. Josip Brunšmid.  
Figure 6. Josip Brunšmid.

prostranom nekropolom ispod grada. Nekropola je prekopavana od vlasnika zemljišta, a samo je pojedine predmete od mještana sakupio vlč. M. Mužina i preko Ivana Milčetića slao ih u zagrebački Narodni muzej pred kraj 19. stoljeća.<sup>48</sup>

Druga nalazišta po otoku Cresu (sl. 2), pa tako i jedan ogroman tumul ispod gradine Pukonjina kod Loznatih, te brojne druge manje tumule, koji su pružili oskudnu ili nikakvu građu, u to je vrijeme istraživao također konzervator S. Petris.<sup>49</sup> No jedino istraživanje gradinskog naselja izvršili su na gradini Sv. Bartolomej iznad Merga, gradonačelnik dr. J. Petris i dr. N. Lemesich iz Cresa, a dio je dokumentacije i građe objavio Ivan Mitis.<sup>50</sup> Izuzev nekoliko narukvica dvoslivnog presjeka, prikupljeni materijal nije publiciran.

S počecima iskopavanja u Osoru, datiraju međutim prva stručna i sondažna iskopavanja na priobalnom dijelu Kvarnera. Od Grobnika do Bakra, Vinodola pa sve južnije do Sv. Jurja i Jablanca (sl. 2; 7; 15), odnosno na onom dijelu kvarnerske regije koji je spadao pod ingerencije zagrebačkog Narodnog muzeja, od 1873. godine istraživanja provodi Šime Ljubić, ondašnji njegov ravnatelj (sl. 5). Posebno se zadržao na opsežnijem istraživanju tri tumula na Garići na sjeveroistočnom, plodnom dijelu otoka Krka, koje istražuje 1873.-1874. godine (sl. 15).<sup>51</sup> Ondje je, u paljevinskim grobovima u dva tumula, koja je sam istraživao, uglavnom zabilježio izuzetno zanimljivu građu iz brončanoga doba koju potom u popisima i objelodanjuje.<sup>52</sup> No još je godinu dana ranije istražen jedan tumul pod nadzorom muzejskog povjerenika vlč. Zahije, vrbničkog župnika, prilikom čega su nađene i zlatne žice – *okrugla od suhoga*

discovered golden wires – "*okrugla od suhoga zlata*".<sup>53</sup> During Ljubić's stay on Krk and the creation of an atmosphere devoted to collecting antiquities, several pieces of Bronze Age attire from Šula near Dobrinj were donated by Dr. Gržetić.<sup>54</sup> Despite the valuable and important finds, further systematic or even rescue excavations of that part of Krk were never again conducted.

As late as two decades later in 1893 and 1895 scientific and systematic excavations of hill-forts on the south-western part of the island of Krk followed, which were conducted by E. Nowotny from the Archaeological and Epigraphic seminar of the University in Vienna.<sup>55</sup> He performed excavations on the hill-fort of Sus or Veli Kaslir on the eastern side above Punat, and on individual tumuli on the site of Negrit (fig. 15). Since Nowotny surveyed the whole southern part of Krk, he located 6 hill-fort settlements with numerous tumuli and recommended further excavations on the territory of Punat and Draga Baščanska.<sup>56</sup> The collected finds were transported to the Museum in Vienna, and since the majority was pottery, it remained unpublished. Only a part of the metal finds was published almost a century later in the seventies of the 20<sup>th</sup> century by Fulvia Lo Schiavo.<sup>57</sup>

The coastal part of Kvarner did not lag behind with respect to the collection of interesting data, intriguing legends and tales – of every manifestation of cultural and also archaeological heritage. The name of rvd. Ante Butković is also mentioned within the context of these activities. He was a parish priest in Kastav and commissioner of Josip Brunšmid from the National Museum (fig. 6). In that period the hinterland of Rijeka was not included into the Italian Kingdom, and luckily the majority of finds, as those from Grobnik, are still preserved

<sup>48</sup> Milčetić 1884: 80-82; Crnić 1886: 66-72.

<sup>49</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 127-128; Batović 2003: 255.

<sup>50</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 129-130; Batović 2003: 255.

<sup>51</sup> Ljubić 1876; Ljubić 1881; Ljubić 1889.

<sup>52</sup> Ljubić 1876: 8-10; Ljubić 1881: 9-10; Ljubić 1889: 165, 179.

<sup>53</sup> The golden finds were later published by Z. Vinski (1959: 208, T. III: 19).

<sup>54</sup> Ljubić 1876: 32, 36; Ljubić 1889: 32, 36.

<sup>55</sup> Mader 2004: 433-443; Mader 2005: 433-438.

<sup>56</sup> Mader 2004: 440-443; Mader 2005: 435-437.

<sup>57</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970.



**Slika 7.** Topografska karta šire riječke regije s označenim položajima prapovijesnih gradina na užem i širem gradskom prstenu (●) uokolo rimske Tarsatike na položaju današnjeg riječkog Starog grada (crveno).

**Figure 7.** Sites covered by the research marked on the topographic map of ancient Tarsatika/Rijeka (red) and other major sites in the broader region (●).

zlata.<sup>53</sup> Sukladno Ljubićevu boravku na otoku Krku, i stvaranja te sakupljačke atmosfere, kao poklon od dr. Gržetića dolaze i prvi predmeti nakita i nošnje iz kasnog brončanog doba iz Šule kod Dobrinja.<sup>54</sup> Usprkos tako vrijednim i značajnim nalazima materijalne kulture daljnja sustavna ili zaštitna istraživanja na tome dijelu otoka Krka nisu nikada provedena.

Tek su dva desetljeća kasnije uslijedila stručna i sustavna istraživanja gradinskih naselja na jugozapadnom dijelu otoka Krka koja je pak provodio E. Nowotny iz Arheološko-epigrafskog seminara Sveučilišta u Beču, i to 1893. i 1895. godine.<sup>55</sup> Istraživao je gradinu Sus, odnosno Veli Kaslir istočno iznad Punta, uz pojedine tumule na položaju Negrit (sl. 15). Kako je pregledao gotovo cijeli južni potez otoka Krka, i ubicirao čak 6 gradinskih naselja s brojnim tumulima, sugerira i preporučuje daljnja iskopavanja na području Punta i posebno na području Drage Baščanske, gdje je i istražio nekoliko grobova.<sup>56</sup> Prikupljena građa otposlana je za bečki muzej, a kako se najvećim dijelom radilo o keramičkom materijalu, ostaje neobjavljena. Dio predmeta od metala tek će 70-ih godina prošlog stoljeća objaviti Fulvia Lo Schiavo.<sup>57</sup>

U prikupljanju zanimljivih podataka, intrigantnih legendi i priča, o svakom obliku kulturno-povijesne, pa stoga i arheološke, baštine

at the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. Today, other finds collected on the Kastav area are preserved in the parish collection Desetinec (ŽZD) in Vrbnik on the island of Krk, where A. Butković was in service after he left Kastav. In his travel notes J. Brunšmid<sup>58</sup> mentioned well preserved artefacts collected by A. Butković in "Mišinci beneath the walls of Kastav" in graves with "cremated deceased" (fig. 8). Contrary to Š. Ljubić, J. Brunšmid did not publish these finds, but detailed descriptions and sketches were preserved in his travel notes.<sup>59</sup> Several decades later in 1931, during excavations for the foundations of the teacher's school in Kastav, on the location of Lokvina (fig. 8), a sword, with the cup like terminal part of the hilt, broken in three pieces was discovered along an extended skeleton. This extraordinary find was also sent to the Museum in Zagreb, where, along with the sword from Grižane, it was published by K. Vinski-Gasparini in 1970.<sup>60</sup>

However, according to historical sources and the preserved documentation, the first excavations of hill forts, started as late as the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. They were conducted by amateur archaeologists who described for the first time the discovered features of prehistoric settlements. The Rijeka teacher Giovanni Cappellari started in 1890 with his research on hill forts on the territory of Rijeka and in the close surroundings. He described all the localities bearing the names of Gradina, Gromača and Gračišće. In 1895 he published all his obser-

<sup>53</sup> O zlatnim nalazima žice naknadno piše Z. Vinski (1959: 208, T. III: 19).

<sup>54</sup> Ljubić 1876: 32, 36; Ljubić 1889: 32, 36.

<sup>55</sup> Mader 2004: 433-443; Mader 2005: 433-438.

<sup>56</sup> Mader 2004: 440-443; Mader 2005: 435-437.

<sup>57</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970.

<sup>58</sup> Brunšmid 1905. Sk. VI: 77-78.

<sup>59</sup> About the research on Kastav, the necropolis and the burial rites in Veli Mišinc see in detail Blečić 2002.

<sup>60</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970.



**Slika 8.** Ortofoto snimak Kastva s ucrtanim pružanjem gradskog/gradinskog bedema (—) i položaja nekropola (●, ▲).

**Figure 8.** Orthophoto of Kastva, with marked location of the prehistoric city walls (—) and with indicated locations of prehistoric cemeteries (●, ▲).

priobalni dio Kvarnera nije nimalo zaostajao. Povezano s tim i takvim djelatnostima, izravno se spominje i ime župnika vlč. Ante Butkovića koji je pak službovao na Kastvu i koji je uživao status muzejskog povjerenika Josipa Brunšmida iz Narodnog muzeja (sl. 6). Naime, u to vrijeme riječko zaleđe nije ulazilo u okvire granica države Kraljevine Italije i zbog toga je, srećom, najveći dio te građe, poput građe s Grobnika, i danas pohranjen u Arheološkom muzeju u Zagrebu. Preostali dio predmeta materijalne kulture, koji je tijekom vremena sakupljen na Kastvu, nalazi se u Župnoj Zbirci Desetinec (ŽZD) u Vrbniku na otoku Krku, gdje je A. Butković nastavio službovati nakon Kastva. U putnim bilješkama J. Brunšmida,<sup>58</sup> navode se dobro očuvani predmeti koje je A. Butković sakupio u "Mišincima ispod bedema Kastva", i to u grobovima sa "spaljenim umrlima" (sl. 8). J. Brunšmid nije poput Š. Ljubića publicirao taj materijal, ali ga je detaljno opisao i skicirao u putnim bilješkama.<sup>59</sup> Nekoliko desetljeća kasnije, 1931. godine prilikom izrade temelja za gradnju učiteljske škole na Kastvu, na području Lokvine (sl. 8), nađen je mač s balčakom u obliku čaše prelomljen na tri dijela i u ispruženom, skeletnom ukopu. Taj je izniman nalaz također poslan u Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, a uz mač iz Grižana, obradila ga je i objavila K. Vinski-Gasparini 1970. godine.<sup>60</sup>

Međutim, prva istraživanja visinskih, tj. gradinskih naselja koja se mogu pratiti u povijesnim izvorima i dostupnoj dokumentaciji, datiraju tek s kraja 19. stoljeća, a provodili su ih arheolozi amateri, koji su istraživali i bilježili razne zanimljive ili tada po prvi put prepoznate nasebinske objekte iz prapovijesnih razdoblja. Tako je riječki učitelj Giovanni Cappellari 1890. godine započeo s konkretnim istraživanjem gradina na području grada Rijeke i u blizjoj okolici. Popisao je

variations in the magazine *La Bilancia*, published in Rijeka, and listed five localities where prehistoric finds were discovered. These were Veli vrh above Pulac, Sv. Križ "near Sv. Katarina", "close to Sv. Ivan" and on Kalvarija "near the Gomila" (fig. 7).<sup>61</sup>

His research was continued in 1895 by the Rijeka Maritime Military Academy professor Albin Belar. He started his first excavations on the hill fort of Gradišće on Veli vrh above Pulac on the northern side of Rijeka (fig. 7). Since he published his results in the magazine *Argo*, published in Ljubljana,<sup>62</sup> the hill fort on Veli vrh became known to a broader professional and scientific public. Due to some outstanding finds and their good state of preservation, the elevated settlement on Veli vrh became the most famous site from the territory of Rijeka and the only hill fort excavated in this region until today. Finds discovered during these excavations deserved the attention of a competent expert, so A. Belar informed Alfons Müllner (fig. 9) the curator from the National Museum in Ljubljana, who immediately attended the excavations on Veli vrh providing scientific consulting (fig. 7). The results and conclusions were published by A. Müllner in 1896 in *Mittheilungen des Naturwissenschaftlichen Clubs in Fiume* (fig. 7).<sup>63</sup> With the aim of additionally promoting the location of the hinterland of Kvarner and its local waters in the traffic connections and the Mediterranean trade with the European hinterland, and also to inform the inhabitants about the precious site and the centennial tradition of their hometown, as well as in order to create the basic postulations for its protection, Müllner delivered two public lectures in Rijeka. They took place at the *Club di scienze naturali* on 7 November 1895 and 3 January 1896 and had several positive impacts.<sup>64</sup> During 1887 and 1888 the research on prehistoric sites in the surroundings of

<sup>58</sup> Brunšmid 1905: Sk. VI: 77-78.

<sup>59</sup> O Kastvu, provedenim istraživanjima, o nekropolama i načinu pokopavanja u Velim Mišincima vidjeti detaljno kod Blečić 2002.

<sup>60</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970.

<sup>61</sup> Cappellari 1895: 1-2.

<sup>62</sup> Belar 1895.

<sup>63</sup> Müllner 1896; Müllner 1897.

<sup>64</sup> Müllner 1896; Müllner 1897; Alebić-Juretić 1998: 81-83.

sva mjesta koja nose naziv Gradina, Gromača i Gračišće. Nedugo zatim, 1895. godine, u riječkom dnevniku *La Bilancia* objavljuje svoja zapažanja i navodi pet položaja s nalazima prapovijesnih ostataka. To su lokaliteti: na Velom Vrhju iznad Pulca, na Sv. križu, "u blizini Sv. Katarine", "blizu Sv. Ivana" i na Kalvariji "blizu Gomile" (sl. 7).<sup>61</sup>

Na istraživački angažman G. Cappellarija, nadovezao se 1895. godine i profesor Vojno-pomorske akademije u Rijeci, Albin Belar. S prvim istraživanjima započeo je na gradini Gradišće na Velom vrhu iznad Pulca sjeverno od Rijeke (sl. 7). U ljubljanskom časopisu *Argo* objavio je rezultate svojih istraživanja,<sup>62</sup> pa gradina na Velom vrhu postaje poznata široj stručnoj i znanstvenoj javnosti. Zbog izvanrednih predmeta i dobre očuvanosti, visinsko naselje na Gradišću na Velom vrhu postaje ujedno najpoznatije s riječkog područja kao i jedina gradina na kojoj su ikad vršena arheološka istraživanja do dana današnjega. Nalazi materijalne kulture, nađeni pri tom istraživanju, bili su doista vrijedni pažnje kompetentnog stručnjaka pa je A. Belar o svemu izvijestio Alfonsa Müllnera (sl. 9), tadašnjeg kustosa ljubljanskog Narodnog muzeja, koji je ubrzo došao u stručno nadziranje iskopavanja na Velom vrhu. Ostvarene rezultate i uočene značajke A. Müllner je objavio 1896. godine u *Mitteilungen des Naturwissenschaftlichen Clubs in Fiume* (sl. 7).<sup>63</sup> No kako bi još više istaknuo položaj kvarnerskog primorja i njegova akvatorija u prometnoj povezanosti i trgovini Sredozemlja s europskim zaleđem, zatim kako bi stanovništvo upoznao s vrijednim nalazištem i stoljetnom tradicijom njihovoga kraja, a time i postavio osnovne postulate zaštite samoga lokaliteta, u Rijeci je održao dva popularno-znanstvena predavanja, 7. 11. 1895. i 3. 1. 1896. godine u *Club di scienze naturali* koje je imalo višestruke, dakako, pozitivne posljedice.<sup>64</sup> Tijekom 1887. i 1888. godine istraživanja prapovijesnih lokaliteta u riječkoj okolini obavlja spomenuti *Club*, ali okolnosti, mjesta i rezultati njihova istraživanja danas nisu uopće poznati.<sup>65</sup>

Idući dalje obalom, jugoistočnije od Rijeke, iz Vinodola svakako su najzanimljiviji nalazi prispjeli iz Grižana, gdje su muzejski povjerenici iskopavali tumule podno samoga mjesta, na području Triblja (sl. 15). Građu je zagrebačkom Muzeju poklonio grižanski kapelan Cvietko Gruber. Š. Ljubić djelomično provodi iskopavanja u Grižanima, a u *Popisima* objavljuje sav prikupljeni repertoar nalaza.<sup>66</sup> Usljedit će potom, 1902. godine, slučajni nalaz, mač s balčakom u obliku čaše, izravno zabijen u matičnu stijenu u grižanskom kamenolomu. Predan zagrebačkom Muzeju, objavit će ga tek K. Vinski-Gasparini zajedno s mačem iz Kastva 1970. godine.<sup>67</sup>

Još južnije područje je Podgorja, odnosno podvelebitskog kanala, od Senja do Jablanca također bilo temeljito istraživano, poznavano i ponešto objavljivano (sl. 15). Najveća je pozornost bila usredotočena na rimska nalazišta i nalaze. Stoga se iznova istraživanjem rimske nekropole na položaju Dražica u Sv. Jurju naišlo i na starije željeznodobne grobove. Grobne cjeline također nisu poznate, kao što je i dokumentacija o nalazima minimalna. Predmete koje je Š. Ljubić prikupio i datirao u željezno doba uspoređuje s nalazima iz Prozora i japodskih nekropola. Građu su dalje sustavno prikupljali carinski prijatelj F. Sabljak i župnik vlč. Biankini, a potom ju slali u Narodni muzej u Zagreb.<sup>68</sup> Napokon, probna su istraživanja provedena i na nekropoli Klačenice iznad Jablanca, gdje je istraženo više

Rijeka was conducted by the mentioned *Club*, but unfortunately the locations and results of their research are unknown.<sup>65</sup>

Proceeding further down on the coast, the most interesting finds from Vinodol came from Grižane, where local amateurs and museum commissioners excavated the tumuli below the town on the territory of Tribalj (fig. 2; 15). Archaeological finds were donated to the Museum in Zagreb by the vicar from Grižane Cvietko Gruber, and Š. Ljubić published the whole inventory in his *Popis*.<sup>66</sup> Later in 1902 a complete sword rammed into the rock was discovered in the stone quarry of Grižane. It was donated to the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb and was published in 1970 together with the sword from Kastav by K. Vinski-Gasparini.<sup>67</sup>

Further southwards, on the territory of Podgorje, or Podvelebitski kanal from Senj to Jablanac, research was conducted too, and several finds were even published (fig. 2; 15), but the focus was oriented towards Roman sites and finds. Consequently, during the excavations of the Roman necropolis on the site of Dražica in Sv. Juraj, older Iron Age graves were discovered. Grave inventories were not preserved and the documentation regarding the finds is minimal. Artefacts were collected by Š. Ljubić and dated into the Iron Age due to comparisons with finds from Prozor and other necropoles of the Japodi. In addition, finds were systematically collected by customs officer F. Sabljak and parish priest rvd. Biankini and sent to the National Museum in Zagreb.<sup>68</sup> Finally, test excavations were conducted on the necropolis of Klačenica above Jablanac, where several graves in stone chests were discovered. The research was conducted in 1889 by Š. Ljubić,<sup>69</sup> and later in 1900 by J. Brunšmid, who then published several grave inventories as well as numerous pieces of jewelry and attire collected from museum commissioners active in the area.<sup>70</sup> Unfortunately, the stimulus to continue with the research on this territory was obviously not strong enough.

Until the 20<sup>th</sup> century the situation in the field as well as the appearance of sites themselves was significantly different than today. At the beginning the research was oriented towards the excavations of necropoles – it was a relatively quick and effective way for the acquisition of finds for the formation of collections. Excavations were mainly conducted or supervised by amateurs and were not methodologically properly documented. Therefore, data about the circumstances of discovery of these finds are mostly unknown or missing. However, the majority of them consisted of individual finds collected by land owners, which suggests a still good state of preservation of these sites at that time. In the broader region, a contact between two archaeological schools was established due to political reasons. Therefore, archaeologists from Zagreb were conducted the research in the regions around Kastav, Grobnik, Vinodol and in Podgorje, whereas archaeologists from Austria and Italy conducted the research on the coastal area and on the islands.

The beginning and the early decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century were influenced by the work, research and results obtained on the Kvarner territory by the Trieste archaeologist Carlo Marchesetti (fig. 10). He included this territory, belonging to the Italian and Austrian littoral into his study of hill-forts/castelieri of Giulia, Kras and Istria.<sup>71</sup> From the territory of Rijeka he included only three hill forts: Veli vrh near

<sup>61</sup> Cappellari 1895: 1-2.

<sup>62</sup> Belar 1895.

<sup>63</sup> Müllner 1896; Müllner 1897.

<sup>64</sup> Müllner 1896; Müllner 1897; Alebić-Juretić 1998: 81-83.

<sup>65</sup> Alebić-Juretić 1998: 82-83.

<sup>66</sup> Ljubić 1876: 28-29, 33-34, 36-37, 39; Ljubić 1889: 71-72, 166.

<sup>67</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970.

<sup>68</sup> Ljubić 1882: 5; Brunšmid 1900: 184; Glavičić 1966.

<sup>65</sup> Alebić-Juretić 1998: 82-83.

<sup>66</sup> Ljubić 1876: 28-29, 33-34, 36-37, 39; Ljubić 1889: 71-72, 166.

<sup>67</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970.

<sup>68</sup> Ljubić 1882: 5; Brunšmid 1900: 184; Glavičić 1966.

<sup>69</sup> Ljubić 1889: 105.

<sup>70</sup> Brunšmid 1901: 53-56.

<sup>71</sup> Marchesetti 1903.





Slika 9. Alfons Müllner.

Figure 9. Alfons Müllner.

grobova u kamenim škrinjama. Istraživanja je 1889. godine provodio Š. Ljubić,<sup>69</sup> a potom i J. Brunšmid, 1900. godine, koji objavljuje grobne cjeline i značajan broj nakita i nošnje koje je prikupio ili su dobiveni od muzejskih povjerenika koji su ondje djelovali.<sup>70</sup> Međutim, sve to nije, izgleda, bio dovoljan poticaj nastavku istraživanja niti na području Podgorja.

Do 20. stoljeća situacija na terenu i izgled samih označenih nalazišta bio je osjetno drugačiji nego što se to danas može razaznati. Istraživanja su bila tek na samim počecima bez većih i temeljitijih zahvata, usmjerena, kako se vidi, ponajviše na iskopavanje nekropola te relativno brzo i učinkovito prikupljanje materijalne građe za formiranje pojedinih zbirki. Dobrim dijelom iskopavanja su poduzimali ili nadzirali amateri i stoga nisu bila metodološki ispravno provedena, a često su i okolnosti nalaza potpuno izostavljene ili nepoznate. Međutim, velika većina građe koja je sakupljena uglavnom je bila pojedinačnog karaktera i prikupljena od vlasnika pojedinih zemljišta, što svjedoči o tada još vrlo dobroj očuvanosti i netaknutosti samih nalazišta. Na široj kvarnerskoj regiji susretale su se dvije arheološke škole, analogno političkim razgraničenjima onoga vremena. Tako su Kastavštinu, Grobinštinu, Vinodol i Podgorje istraživali zagrebački, a Rijeku, obalni prostor te otoke, talijanski i austrijski arheolozi.

Početak i rana desetljeća 20. stoljeća obilježena su radom, istraživanjima i rezultatima koje je na prostoru Kvarnera realizirao tršćanski arheolog Carlo Marchesetti (sl. 10). Tako je u svoju sintetsku studiju o gradinama u Julijskoj Krajini, odnosno Krasu i Istri, uključio i prostor Kvarnera, koji je pripadao talijanskom, odnosno

Pulac, Sv. Križ above Martinščica and Stupnjak, but also Kastav and Grobnik in its hinterland (fig. 7).<sup>72</sup> As G. Cappellari did earlier, he noted all the localities called Gradac, Gradina, Gračišće and Gradišće on the Opatija side of the coastal area from Mune to Volosko and on the west to Roč including also the entire Učka. The number of hill forts and their distribution enabled C. Marchesetti to formulate an assertion about a long-lasting and systematic settling of this territory in the past. Additionally, he substantiated this statement with the analysis of finds, mainly from Gradišće on Veli vrh above Pulac, offered to him by the researchers from Rijeka. Besides local toponymic and hill-fort localities, C. Marchesetti located and published the important hill fort on the territory of today's town of Kastav (fig. 7-8). Marchesetti substantiated his claim by publishing the material, collected until then, of the sinkhole of Veli Mišinac discovered during the building of a drain in 1900 and dated it thus into the "La Tene period", similarly to the ones discovered in Jezerine and Prozor.<sup>73</sup>

He conducted only minor excavations on the necropolis of Osor in 1901 and on several hill-forts on Cres and Lošinj (fig. 2). Firstly, Marchesetti published several finds in 1903, but in 1924 he presented the largest number of finds from the museum collection originated mainly from Kavanela in Osor in his work *Isole del Quarnero* (fig. 4).<sup>74</sup> Until the modern publications from the end of 20<sup>th</sup> century this was one of the most important and significant publications for the territory of Cres and Lošinj archipelago, as well as for Krk and the coastal area all the way up to Rijeka.<sup>75</sup>

Marchesetti was aware of the value and importance of the finds from Osor and tried thus to create an integral picture and the condition of the "hill-fort" culture on this territory. It led him to a detailed recognition of all known hill-forts and tumuli and some test excavations on selected ones. His list included 59 sites from which Vela Straža near Osor, Pukonjina and Skulka on Cres and Polanža on Lošinj, or Turan (*Arbit*) on Unije stand out (fig. 2).<sup>76</sup> However, the collected finds, mainly pottery, did not produce the anticipated results. It was a destitute collection in comparison to the "civilization" that was flourishing in Osor. He concluded that these hill-forts were smaller, poorer and less important settlements, mainly abandoned after the Bronze Age.<sup>77</sup>

Unlike the western coastal area of Kvarner and the islands of Cres and Lošinj, C. Marchesetti was poorly acquainted with the island of Krk. He spent less time there and never conducted any research on it. Only partly was he able to list 25 sites, mainly concentrated on the central and eastern part of the island.<sup>78</sup> His cooperation with Š. Ljubić was more than clear, since he presented several times the results of Ljubić's research – always mentioning the *golden necklaces* from the tumulus in Garica, where he also mentioned the surrounding settlements on the hill-forts of Sv. Jure and Keršovani vrh, which were pointed out to him by Š. Ljubić.<sup>79</sup> In addition, Marchesetti stressed in particular the largest hill-fort with megalith walls on Gračišće near Dobrinj and the local curiosity of Krk – the tumulus inside the hill-fort (fig. 15).<sup>80</sup> It is interesting to mention that Marchesetti failed to list prehistoric sites from the southern part of the island, on the territory from Punat to Baška, which were earlier discovered by E. Nowotny

<sup>69</sup> Ljubić 1889: 105.

<sup>70</sup> Brunšmid 1901: 53-56.

<sup>72</sup> Marchesetti 1903: 103; the map of the hill forts.

<sup>73</sup> Marchesetti 1903: 107.

<sup>74</sup> Marchesetti 1924.

<sup>75</sup> Imamović 1979: 99-100; Batović 2003: 254-255.

<sup>76</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 128-129, 131-133, 137-140, Fig. 4-5; 13.

<sup>77</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 126-140.

<sup>78</sup> Marchesetti 1903: 110-111; Marchesetti 1924: 123-126.

<sup>79</sup> Marchesetti 1903: 111; Marchesetti 1924: 124.

<sup>80</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 124.

austrijskom primorju.<sup>71</sup> Na riječkom je području obuhvatio samo tri gradine: Veli vrh kod Pulca, Sv. križ iznad Martinšćice i Stupnjak te Kastav i Grobnik u zaleđu (sl. 7).<sup>72</sup> No kao i G. Cappellari, zabilježio je sve poznate lokalitete koji nose toponim Gradec, Gradina i Gračišće, Gradišće, na opatijskoj strani priobalja, od Muna do Voloskog i na zapadu do Roča obuhvativši tako i cijelu Učku. Broj tih gradinskih lokaliteta kao i njihov smještaj po određenom sustavu, omogućio je C. Marchesetti postavljanje teze o dugotrajnom i sustavnom naseljavanju. Dodatno je tu misao argumentirao i obradom pokretne arheološke građe koju su mu riječki istraživači ponudili, osobito s Gradišća na Velom vrhu iznad Pulca. Osim mjesne toponomastike i gradinskih lokaliteta, C. Marchesetti ubicira i objavljuje izvanredno važno gradinsko naselje na mjestu današnjega grada Kastva (sl. 7-8). I u ovom je slučaju svoju tezu potkrijepio do tada sakupljenim nalazima materijalne kulture nađenim u vrtači Veli Mišinac prilikom gradnje slivnika 1900. godine, temeljem kojih je nekropolu odredio kao "latensku" sličnu onima u Jezerinama, Prozoru i sl.<sup>73</sup>

Tek manja probna istraživanja provodi na osorskoj nekropoli, 1901. godine, kao i na drugim gradinskim nalazištima otoka Cresa i Lošinja (sl. 2). Pored podataka koje donosi još 1903. u nešto skromnijem, 1924. godine u radu *Isole del Quarnero* u opširnijem se izdanju osvrnuo na to područje, s dotad najvećim izborom objavljene materijalne građe upravo iz osorske Kavaneele, zapravo iz muzejske zbirke (sl. 4).<sup>74</sup> Do suvremenih objava s kraja 20. stoljeća, bio je to jedan od najznačajnijih i najvažnijih referentnih radova za cresko-lošinjско otočje, Krk i priobalno područje do Rijeke.<sup>75</sup>

C. Marchesetti znao je vrijednost i znamenitost osorske materijalne ostavštine, stoga je pokušao dobiti cjelovitiju sliku i stanje "gradinske" kulture na tome području. Zbog toga je proveo temeljito rekognosciranje svih poznatih gradina i tumula, a na ponekima je i istraživao manje probne sonde. Popisao je ukupno 59 nalazišta, od kojih se izdvajaju Vela Straža kod Osora, Pukonjina i Skulka na Cresu te Polanža na Lošinj, odnosno Turan (*Arbit*) na Unijama (sl. 2).<sup>76</sup> Međutim, prikupljena, uglavnom keramička građa, nije pružila priželjkivane rezultate, jer je ionako bila vrlo oskudna, u odnosu na "civilizaciju" koja je cvjetala u Osoru. Zaključio je, kako su te gradine različitih funkcija samo manja, siromašnija i uglavnom napuštena naselja nakon brončanog doba.<sup>77</sup>

U odnosu na zapadno kvarnersko priobalje i cresko-lošinjско otočnu skupinu C. je Marchesetti znatno slabije poznao otok Krk, najmanje se na njemu zadržavao i uopće nije ondje istraživao. Tako samo parcijalno navodi nalazišta uglavnom koncentrirana na središnjem i istočnom dijelu otoka, njih ukupno oko 25.<sup>78</sup> Njegova je suradnja sa Š. Ljubićem bila i više nego jasna, budući da vrlo često prenosi rezultate njegovih istraživanja na Krku, pa tako redovito naglašava nalaz *zlatne ogrlice* iz tumula u Garici, gdje spominje i okolna naselja na gradini Sv. Jure i Keršovani vrh,<sup>79</sup> odnosno ona prapovijesna nalazišta koja mu prenosi sam Š. Ljubić. Pogotovo naglašava najveću gradinu s megalitskim bedemima na Gračišću kod Dobrinja kao i krčku specifičnost tumula



Slika 10. Carlo Marchesetti.

Figure 10. Carlo Marchesetti.

although he was in good relations and constant contacts with the latter.<sup>81</sup> Finally, he published the report of excavations conducted by amateurs on the necropolis of Krk located on the Šinigoj area and presented the finds discovered there.<sup>82</sup>

However, the research on Krk continued in the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. By then, the most important and most representative finds from Baška (sl. 2; 15) had been discovered, and this during the excavations conducted from 1910 to 1912 by Mihovil Abramić and Josef Szombathy (fig. 11; 12) who resumed the previous excavations of E. Novotny.<sup>83</sup> They excavated one part of the necropolis on the location of the church of Sv. Kristofor above Baška, whose finds were neither as numerous as J. Szombathy was used to after his excavations in Most na Soči, nor significant enough to be published. However, due to his origins, M. Abramić was more persistent in his desire to continue, but was finally forced to give up. All the archive records as well as part of the original finds were analysed and published by Brigitta Mader.<sup>84</sup>

Regarding the coastal area, right after C. Marchesetti, Guido Depoli, also an amateur researcher from Rijeka published in *Studi. Saggi. Apunti* three contributions on prehistoric hill-forts – the settlements on Veli vrh above Pulac, Sv. Križ and Stupnjak near Rijeka and indirectly Kastav and Grobnik (fig. 2; 7-8) on the surrounding area, which he regarded without any doubt as hill-fort settlements.<sup>85</sup>

In this period also the work of archaeologist Raffaella Battaglia *Necropoli e Castelieri del eta del ferro del Carnaro* was published.<sup>86</sup> In it he

<sup>71</sup> Marchesetti 1903.

<sup>72</sup> Marchesetti 1903: 103; karta gradinskih naselja.

<sup>73</sup> Marchesetti 1903: 107.

<sup>74</sup> Marchesetti 1924.

<sup>75</sup> Imamović 1979: 99-100; Batović 2003: 254-255.

<sup>76</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 128-129, 131-133, 137-140, Fig. 4-5, 13.

<sup>77</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 126-140.

<sup>78</sup> Marchesetti 1903: 110-111; Marchesetti 1924: 123-126.

<sup>79</sup> Marchesetti 1903: 111; Marchesetti 1924: 124.

<sup>81</sup> Mader 2004: 445-446.

<sup>82</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 126.

<sup>83</sup> Mader 2006: 245-265.

<sup>84</sup> Mader 2006.

<sup>85</sup> Depoli 1909: 49; Depoli 1913: 84; Depoli 1928: 159, 253.

<sup>86</sup> Battaglia 1927.



**Slika 11.** Jozsef Szombathy.  
**Figure 11.** Jozsef Szombathy.



**Slika 12.** Mihovil Abramić.  
**Figure 12.** Mihovil Abramić.

usred gradinskog naselja (sl. 15).<sup>80</sup> Zanimljivim se svakako čini navesti, kako autor ne ubraja ona prapovijesna nalazišta na južnom dijelu otoka, od Punta do Baške, koje je ranije ubicirao i E. Nowotny, iako su zapravo njih dvojica također bili u dobrim i stalnim odnosima.<sup>81</sup> Naposljetku, Marchesetti nas izvještava o već tada poznatom (nestručnom) iskapanju u samom gradu Krku, na predjelu Šinigoj gdje se nalazila gradska nekropola (sl. 14), kao i o nalazima koji su pri tomu nađeni.<sup>82</sup>

No Krk se i dalje istraživao u tim ranim desetljećima 20. stoljeća. Naime, otada i datiraju jedni od najvažnijih i najreprezentativnijih nalaza iz Baške (sl. 2; 15). Riječ je svakako o istraživanjima koja su se od 1910. do 1912. godine nadovezala na prethodna poduzeta od E. Nowotnya, a proveli su ih Mihovil Abramić i Jozsef Szombathy (sl. 11; 12).<sup>83</sup> Istraživali su, naime, dio nekropole na položaju kod crkvice sv. Kristofora iznad Baške čija građa nije bila izrazito brojna, s obzirom na poznate istraživačke navike J. Szombathya s tadašnjih istraživanja u Mostu na Soči, niti izrazito značajna da bi ju publicirao. No s obzirom na svoje podrijetlo, M. Abramić je bio ustrajniji u želji da nastavi s istraživanjima, iako je naposljetku bio prisiljen odustati. Svu je arhivsku dokumentaciju, kao i dio izvorne građe iz tih događanja, nedavno obradila i objelodanila Brigitta Mader.<sup>84</sup>

Glede priobalne strane, nakon C. Marchesettija, Guido Depoli, također riječki istraživač-amater, objavljuje u *Studi. Saggi. Apuntti* tri rada u svezi s prapovijesnim gradinama, odnosno naseljima na Velom vrhu iznad Pulca, Sv. križu i Stupnjaku oko Rijeke, te posredno o Kastvu i Grobniku (sl. 2; 7-8), u okolnom gravitirajućem

presented the results of the research carried out on the territory belonging to *Provincia del Carnaro* – this means Kvarner and Kranjska (i.e. today's Notranjska). However, from the territory of Rijeka he presented only a humble topographical note regarding the hill-fort Veli vrh above Pulac. He also mentioned several finds concluding that the pottery displayed Bronze Age forms, but that the metal finds were typical of the Iron Age. Much more detailed was his presentation of the hill-fort and necropolis of Torrenova (today Trnovo near Ilirska Bistrica) and the hill-fort of Fontana del Conte also located in today Slovenia. R. Battaglia mentioned several times in his works the territory of Rijeka, but these were only marginal analogies or ethnographic data.<sup>87</sup>

The first attempts of research were conducted on the hill-fort of Solin above Martinšćica (fig. 7) in the thirties of the last century. It was located on the Croatian territory under jurisdiction of the Municipal Museum in Sušak – that was the reason why employee and first museum director Ivan Sveško (fig. 13) excavated there on several occasions test trenches. During these campaigns he noted that the pottery finds could be dated to a broad time span covering all periods from the Neolithic to the Roman period.<sup>88</sup> A part of these finds was later lost, but some were preserved and are stored at the Maritime and History Museum of the Croatian Littoral in Rijeka (PPMHP), where the original documentation has been recently discovered together with notes from the inventory books of some excavations by I. Sveško.<sup>89</sup>

In the thirties some of the finds were published that were collected in 1928 during infrastructure works on the territory of the Roman and prehistoric necropolis of Vila Šinigoj in Krk on the plot of the future "Tvornica leda"(fig. 15). On that plot skeletal and cremated burials were discovered from both older and younger periods. From

<sup>80</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 124.

<sup>81</sup> Mader 2004: 445-446.

<sup>82</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 126.

<sup>83</sup> Mader 2006: 245-265.

<sup>84</sup> Mader 2006.

<sup>87</sup> Battaglia 1927; Battaglia 1958.

<sup>88</sup> Sveško 1945.

<sup>89</sup> Sveško 1945.

prostoru, za koje tvrdi da su nedvojbeno bila gradinska naselja.<sup>85</sup>

U tom je razdoblju objavljen i rad arheologa Raffaella Battaglie *Necropoli e Casteleri del eta del ferro del Carnaro*,<sup>86</sup> u kojem donosi rezultate arheoloških istraživanja s područja koje je pripadalo talijanskoj *Provincia del Carnaro*, dakle, Kvarnera i Kranjske. Međutim, s područja Rijeke objavljuje samo šturi topografski prikaz gradine Veli vrh iznad Pulca (sl. 7), gdje spominje i neke karakteristične predmete materijalne kulture, zaključujući kako keramički materijal pokazuje odlike brončanog, a metalni odlike željeznoga doba. Opširnije se pozabavio gradinom i nekropolom Torrenova, današnje Trnovo u blizini Ilirske Bistrice te gradinom Fontana del Conte, danas također u Sloveniji. R. Battaglia više se puta osvrtao na riječka prapovijesna nalazišta, ali to su bile uglavnom samo oskudne analogne crtice ili etnografski podaci.<sup>87</sup>

Tridesetih godina prošloga stoljeća učinjeni su i prvi pokušaji istraživanja na gradini Solin iznad Martinšćice (sl. 7). Gradina se nalazila na hrvatskom teritoriju, odnosno u nadležnosti Gradskog muzeja Sušak. Stoga je djelatnik i prvi ravnatelj Ivan Sveško (sl. 13) u nekoliko navrata na tome visinskom naselju vršio sondažna istraživanja. Pri tome je uočio keramički materijal kojeg je okvirno mogao datirati u razmjerno ogromno razdoblje; od neolitika do antičkog doba.<sup>88</sup> Dio te građe je izgubljen, a dio se nalazi u pohrani Pomorskog i povijesnog muzeja Hrvatskog primorja Rijeka (PPMHP), gdje je nedavno pronađena dokumentacija, zapisi te izvadci iz stare inventarne knjige nekih Sveškovih istraživanja.<sup>89</sup>

Tridesetih je godina objavljen i dio građe koji je prikupljen prilikom izradbe infrastrukturnih radova na području rimske, ali i prapovijesne, nekropole Vile Šinigoj kod Krka, odnosno na parcelama za buduću "Tvornicu leda", 1928. godine (sl. 15). Na tome je mjestu potvrđeno pokopavanje kako u skeletnim tako i u paljevinskim grobovima, kako za starija tako i za mlađa razdoblja. Od prapovijesnog materijala objavljena je samo jedna tabla s nekoliko tipova fibula koje je dokumentirao i obradio Frane Bulić u Splitu 1929. godine.<sup>90</sup> Ivan Žic-Rokov, donosi, međutim, popis od nešto većeg broja predmeta, koji bi također pripadali željeznodobnoj provenijenciji, a koji su nakon restauriranja vraćeni njihovim privatnim vlasnicima.<sup>91</sup>

No nakon Drugog svjetskog rata u znanstvenoj se literaturi nalazi sa šireg kvarnerskog područja pojavljuju tek usporedno. Arheološka istraživanja na otočnom i priobalnom dijelu Kvarnera provodila su se uglavnom rekognosciranjima, reambulacijama terena te manjim probnim istraživanjima na gradinama i tumulima, kao upravo logičan nastavak Marchesettijevih istraživanja. Velik dio tih zahvata odvijao se tada i u okviru zaštitnih istraživačkih radova ili kompleksnijih građevinskih projekata.

Na cresko-lošinjskom otočju od 50-ih godina 20. stoljeća sustavno je istraživao Vladimir Mirosavljević (sl. 14), profesor sa zagrebačkog Sveučilišta, koji je nastavio topografsko i tipološko istraživanje gradina. Ubicirao je 38 gradina na Cresu, Lošinju, Unijama, Srakana i Iloviku (sl. 2), a na 21 gradini izveo je probna, sondažna istraživanja. Nešto detaljnija izvješća i tlocrtne situacije donosi za gradine Vela Straža na Cresu, Maslovnik, Polanžu, Laće, Halmac,

the prehistoric material, only a single table with several different fibulae types was documented and processed by Frane Bulić in Split in 1929.<sup>90</sup> However, Ivan Žic-Rokov made a somewhat longer list of artefacts, that could also be dated into the Iron Age, but were returned after restoration to their private owners.<sup>91</sup>

However, after World War II the finds from the broader Kvarner area appeared only sporadically in the scientific literature. Archaeological research on the islands and the coastal part of Kvarner, as a logical continuation of C. Marchesetti's work, was mainly limited to field recognition and surveying, as well as some minor test excavations of hill-forts and tumuli. The majority of these interventions were conducted during rescue excavations and on building sites.

In the 1950s Zagreb University professor Vladimir Mirosavljević (fig. 14) continued the topographical and typological research on hill-forts on the islands of Cres and Lošinj. He located 38 hill-forts on Cres, Lošinj, Unije, Srakane and Ilovik (fig. 2) and excavated trial trenches on 21 of them. Still, only preliminary reports and plans were published on the hill-forts of Vela Straža on Cres, Maslovnik, Polanža, Laće, Halmac, Ilovica, Skulka, Pelginja, Sv. Bartolomej and Halm.<sup>92</sup> A synthetic and thorough study was never made and the collected finds were never analysed nor published.<sup>93</sup> Today, the largest part of this collection is housed at the Croatian Academy of Sciences (HAZU) in Zagreb.

The research of the urban centre of Osor (fig. 4), always attractive and interesting, continued from 1951 to 1953 and was conducted by Boris Bačić, a curator from the Archaeological Museum of Istria (AMI) in Pula, and Andro Mohorovičić from the HAZU from Zagreb, who excavated the high mound along the Kaštel from the inner side of the western city walls. Bačić discovered a succession of strata ranging from the Early Bronze Age to the Iron Age. He also excavated two tumuli near Beli,<sup>94</sup> whose finds, mainly stored at the AMI in Pula, are still unpublished.

In 1959 Josip Mladin, also a curator from the AMI in Pula, continued the research by excavating the tumulus near Osor's cemetery of Sv. Marija near Bijar, which was actually located on the eastern side of the former city walls (fig. 4). There he discovered 7 graves with skeletons in a crouched position buried in stone chests with different grave goods. Very soon he published detailed illustrations of the situation together with an extensive catalogue of the finds.<sup>95</sup> This was the first case on the territory of Kvarner to have a tumulus and graves documented into detail. We can assume that this was the location of a larger necropolis with several tumuli that was partly destroyed by the building of later megalithic city walls.

On the territory of the urban centre and the city walls of Osor (fig. 4), systematic and rescue excavations were conducted by A. Mohorovičić<sup>96</sup> from the HAZU in Zagreb. From the 1970s also the Zagreb Archaeological Institute joined the research and several excavations were conducted by Aleksandra Faber.<sup>97</sup> By publishing mainly topographical and architectural data on the city walls and the port, Faber presented only a part of the results of her research and collected finds. However, only a smaller amount of such finds has been stored in the Osor archaeological collection (AZO). Her research

<sup>85</sup> Depoli 1909: 49; Depoli 1913: 84; Depoli 1928: 159, 253.

<sup>86</sup> Battaglia 1927.

<sup>87</sup> Battaglia 1927; Battaglia 1958.

<sup>88</sup> Sveško 1945.

<sup>89</sup> Sveško 1945.

<sup>90</sup> Polonijo, Bulić 1931: 73-74.

<sup>91</sup> Žic-Rokov 1962: 34-36.

<sup>90</sup> Polonijo, Bulić 1931: 73-74.

<sup>91</sup> Žic-Rokov 1962: 34-36.

<sup>92</sup> Mirosavljević 1974: 271-290.

<sup>93</sup> Batović 2003: 256.

<sup>94</sup> Batović 2003: 257.

<sup>95</sup> Mladin 1960.

<sup>96</sup> Mohorovičić 1953; Mohorovičić 1956.

<sup>97</sup> Faber 1974; Faber 1976; Faber 1980; Faber 1982; Faber 2000.



Slika 13. Ivan Sveško.

Figure 13. Ivan Sveško.

Ilovicu, Skulku, Pelginju, Sv. Bartolomej i Halm.<sup>92</sup> Ipak, preostali su nam samo preliminarni izvještaji i šturi opisi eventualnih stratigrafija, odnosno keramičke produkcije. Sintetska, cjelokupna studija nije nikada priređena, a prikupljena građa nije bila strukturirana i objavljivana.<sup>93</sup> Najveći dio građe čuva se danas u HAZU u Zagrebu.

Prostor urbane jezgre Osora (sl. 4), oduvijek atraktivan i zanimljiv, nastavili su istraživati od 1951. do 1954. Boris Bačić kustos iz Arheološkog muzeja Istre (AMI) u Puli i A. Mohorovičić iz Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti (HAZU) u Zagrebu. B. Bačić istraživao je visoki nasip uz Kaštel, s unutarnje strane zapadnih gradskih vrata, sa stratigrafijom od ranog brončanog do željeznog doba. Isti je autor istraživao i pojedinačne grobove po Osoru kao i dva tumula kod Belog.<sup>94</sup> Građa je većinom pohranjena u AMI i do danas je ostala neobjavljena.

Zaštitnim radovima 1959. godine nadovezao se i Josip Mladin, također kustos iz AMI u Puli, koji istražuje tumul uz današnje osorsko groblje sv. Marije prema Bijaru, odnosno uz pružanje istočnog gradskog bedema (sl. 4). Ondje je dokumentirao ukupno 7 grobova zgrčenaca u kamenim škrinjama s raznim priložima nakita i nošnje, koje autor s pobližom tlocrtnom situacijom i katalogom uskoro i objavljuje.<sup>95</sup> To je bio prvi tumul i grobovi uopće s područja Kvarnera koji su imali cjelovitiju dokumentaciju o provedenim istraživanjima. Na tom se istočnom dijelu grada vjerojatno nalazila povećana nekropola pod tumulima, koju djelomično presijeca i gradnja kasnijih, megalitskih gradskih bedema.

<sup>92</sup> Miroslavljević 1974: 271-290.

<sup>93</sup> Batović 2003: 256.

<sup>94</sup> Batović 2003: 257.

<sup>95</sup> Mladin 1960.

showed that the middle of the broader, today reduced, centre of Osor has been settled ever since the Bronze Age.

A similar situation developed on the island of Krk where V. Miroslavljević continued topographical research and excavated test trenches on several hill-forts such as Kostriļ, Gradina, Sokolica, Sv. Ivan and Bag, as well as on numerous tumuli. However, the collected finds remained mostly unpublished.<sup>98</sup> The town of Krk itself with its urban centre (fig. 15) was also excavated by A. Mohorovičić. Beneath Roman structures, Mohorovičić regularly found prehistoric layers and architectural elements with a larger amount of prehistoric movable material,<sup>99</sup> which was additionally confirmed by the excavations directed in Krk and Omišalj (Fulfinum) by A. Faber<sup>100</sup> (fig. 2; 15). Unfortunately, the movable material has not been published yet and is unavailable to the scientific community.

On the other side of the "channel" on the area of Podgorje below Velebit, V. Miroslavljević continued the research in a more systematic way. He located and partly excavated 12 hill-forts among which the ones on Kuk, Lisac, Lukovo, Sv. Juraj, Klačnica and Starigrad should be mentioned.<sup>101</sup> On prehistoric sites, mostly hill-forts and necropolises on the territory of Senj, Sv. Juraj and Stinica some small-scale research was carried out by Ante Glavičić, curator of the Municipal Museum in Senj, who published a few graves from Senj and Stinica<sup>102</sup> (fig. 2; 15). However, the only excavated and published cave site from this territory is Vaganačka peć.<sup>103</sup> An interesting collection of Early Iron Age finds, most probably grave goods from a single burial from Sv. Juraj, were published by Tihomila Težak-Gregl.<sup>104</sup> More recently, an overview of the research and the finds from this area has been presented by Blaženka Ljubović, also a curator of the Municipal Museum in Senj.<sup>105</sup>

The post-World War II period on the entire Kvarner territory was marked by the energetic engagement of Radmila Matejčić (fig. 16), curator of the Maritime and History Museum of the Croatian Littoral (PPMHP). She produced numerous publications in which numerous hill-forts, the largest number of them until then, with different functions and from different periods ranging from prehistory through the historical periods were discussed.<sup>106</sup> During her participation in the international research project *Preatentura*, i.e. *Claustra Alpium Iuliarum*, she collected data on prehistoric sites in the north-western part of the territory around Rijeka. In 1972 she also excavated the necropolis in the sinkhole of Veli Mišinac near Kastav (fig. 7-8).

Her work was a major contribution to a better understanding of the Kvarner islands. As early as 1961 she conducted rescue excavation in Krk on the site of Šinigoj (fig. 15), where she discovered several devastated graves from the Late Iron Age.<sup>107</sup> Her work continued with the rescue excavation of the hill-fort of Zagrajine-Svilov in 1965. There she documented the remains of megalithic walls and the dimensions of the site turned out to be the second in size after the one in Gračičće.<sup>108</sup> The finds collected from the surrounding devastated tumuli have been preserved in the collection of the Franciscan

<sup>98</sup> Miroslavljević 1974: 271; Batović 2003: 256.

<sup>99</sup> Mohorovičić 1964.

<sup>100</sup> Faber 1965; Faber 1976; Faber 1980; Faber 2000.

<sup>101</sup> Miroslavljević 1974: 271.

<sup>102</sup> Glavičić 1966.

<sup>103</sup> Forenbaher, Vranjican 1985.

<sup>104</sup> Težak Gregl 1984.

<sup>105</sup> Ljubović 2000. For the southern area of Podvelebit, the state of research and individual finds see also the publication of M. Dubolnić 2006.

<sup>106</sup> Matejčić 1983; Matejčić 1988 – with the listed older literature.

<sup>107</sup> Matejčić 1963; Žic-Rokov 1962: 36-37.

<sup>108</sup> Matejčić 1965.

Na prostoru gradske jezgre i bedema Osora (sl. 4) zaštitne i sustavne radove provodio je Institut HAZU iz Zagreba, koje je provodio Andro Mohorovičić.<sup>96</sup> Od 70-ih godina 20. stoljeća pridružuje se istraživanjima i Arheološki institut iz Zagreba, koji ondje više-kratno iskopava pod vodstvom Aleksandre Faber.<sup>97</sup> Objavivši uglavnom topografske i arhitektonske podatke gradskih bedema i luka, potonja je samo djelomično predstavila rezultate svojih istraživanja i pri tomu prikupljenu materijalnu građu, koja se samo manjim dijelom čuva u Arheološkoj zbirci u Osoru (AZO). Njezin je doprinos svakako vrijedan spoznaje kako se na širem, danas reduciranom, gradskom arealu Osora nastanjivalo u kontinuitetu od brončanog doba.

Slična je situacija u tome vremenu zabilježena i za otok Krk u cijelosti. V. Miroslavljević također rekognoscira i probno istražuje gradine, kao što su one na Kostrilju, Gradini, Sokolici, Sv. Ivanu i Bagu, kao i brojne tumule, no prikupljeni nalazi materijalne kulture uglavnom ostaju neobjavljeni.<sup>98</sup> Sam grad Krk i urbanu jezgru (sl. 15) istraživao je također A. Mohorovičić, koji je u antičkim supstrukcijama redovito nalazio prapovijesne slojeve i dijelove arhitekture, s većom količinom prapovijesnog pokretnog materijala,<sup>99</sup> a to su upravo dalje potvrđivala i istraživanja koja je ne smo u Krku, već i u Omišlju (Fulfinumu) provodila A. Faber (sl. 2; 15).<sup>100</sup> Na našu žalost pokretna je građa još i danas neobrađena i nedostupna znanstvenom vrednovanju.

S druge strane "kanala", područje je podvelebitskog Podgorja sustavnije istraživao jedino V. Miroslavljević koji je zabilježio i dijelom sondirao 12 gradinskih naselja, od kojih se svakako izdvajaju ona na Kuku, Liscu, Lukovu, Sv. Jurju, Klačenicu i Starigradu.<sup>101</sup> Prapovijesnim nalazištima, gradina i nekropola na području Senja, Sv. Jurja i Stinice bavio se, u nešto manjem opsegu, i Ante Glavičić, ondašnji kustos u Gradskom muzeju u Senju, koji je publicirao par grobova iz Senja i Stinice (sl. 2; 15).<sup>102</sup> Međutim, jedino istraživano i objavljeno špiljsko nalazište s toga područja je Vaganačka peć.<sup>103</sup> Posve zanimljiv, najvjerojatnije grobni inventar starijeg željeznog doba iz Sv. Jurja obradila je potom i Tihomila Težak-Gregl.<sup>104</sup> U novije vrijeme pregled istraživanja i nalaza s toga prostora pružila je Blaženka Ljubović također kustosica Gradskog muzeja u Senju.<sup>105</sup>

Poslijeratno je razdoblje na čitavom kvarnerskom području, ipak u najvećoj mjeri obilježeno energičnim radom Radmile Matejčić (sl. 16), tadašnje kustosice Pomorskog i povijesnog muzeja u Rijeci. Uslijedili su njezini brojni radovi u kojima se navode razne gradine, do tada njihov najveći broj, s različitim funkcijama, namjenama i interpretacijama, kroz različita prapovijesna i povijesna razdoblja.<sup>106</sup> Sudjelujući u međunarodnom istraživačkom projektu *Pre-attenturae*, odnosno *Claustreae Alpium Iuliarum*, R. Matejčić je tom prilikom zabilježila i prapovijesna nalazišta na sjeverozapadnom potezu riječke regije, a 1972. godine uspjela je, prema ondašnjoj



Slika 14. Vladimir Miroslavljević.

Figure 14. Vladimir Miroslavljević.

monastery on Košljun. Finally, she conducted rescue excavations on the devastated tumulus in Šula near Dobrinj (fig. 15) in 1966,<sup>109</sup> and continued her research orientation by conducting rescue excavations on the island of Rab excavating on a larger tumulus in Gromčica near Lopar 9 graves organized around the central, most important grave in 1967 (fig. 17).<sup>110</sup> This amazing discovery was reproduced in the scientific literature several times.<sup>111</sup> Along with the tumulus near Sv. Marija on Osor, this was the second necropolis with tumuli to be excavated and documented in a proper manner. It must be pointed out that R. Matejčić was very prompt in publishing the finds from her excavations together with all the documentation, catalogues of finds and their illustrations. Most of them are today stored in the PPMHP in Rijeka.

On the other hand, Ranko Starac, curator in PPMHP in Rijeka, was the first to conduct research on prehistoric hill-forts and tumuli on the whole Kvarner region. His engagement marked the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Some of his observations were presented in 1992 in the catalogue of the exhibition *Izbor iz arheološke građe Kvarnerskog područja*. In this text he mentioned the sites of Kalvarija, Stupnjak and Sv. Križ (Srdoči), which, he claims, do not exist anymore, and the sites of Sv. Križ above Martinšćica, Veli vrh above Pulac and the hill fort Vela straža.<sup>112</sup> In 1996 he returned to hill-forts in the surroundings of Rijeka, adding also Solin and Orlac,<sup>113</sup> and more recently he excavated test trenches on the hill-fort of Sv. Križ

<sup>96</sup> Mohorovičić 1953; Mohorovičić 1956.

<sup>97</sup> Faber 1974; Faber 1976; Faber 1980; Faber 1982; Faber 2000.

<sup>98</sup> Miroslavljević 1974: 271; Batović 2003: 256.

<sup>99</sup> Mohorovičić 1964.

<sup>100</sup> Faber 1965; Faber 1976; Faber 1980; Faber 2000.

<sup>101</sup> Miroslavljević 1974: 271.

<sup>102</sup> Glavičić 1966.

<sup>103</sup> Forenbaher, Vranjican 1985.

<sup>104</sup> Težak-Gregl 1984.

<sup>105</sup> Ljubović 2000. O južnom području Podvelebita, stanju istraženosti i pojedinim nalazima materijalne kulture vidjeti i noviji pregledni rad M. Dubolnić 2006.

<sup>106</sup> Matejčić 1983; Matejčić 1988 – uz navedenu svu stariju literaturu.

<sup>109</sup> Matejčić 1966.

<sup>110</sup> Matejčić 1968.

<sup>111</sup> E.g. Harding 1995; Mihovilić 2001b.

<sup>112</sup> Starac 1992.

<sup>113</sup> Starac 1996.



**Slika 15.** Otok Krk s najvažnijim prapovijesnim nalazištima (▲), nekropolama i tumulima (●).

**Figure 15.** Island of Krk, with the indication of the most important archaeological sites (▲), prehistoric necropolises and tumuli (●).

metodologiji, istražiti nekropolu u vrtači Veli Mišinac kraj Kastva (sl. 7-8).

Ogroman doprinos pružila je i k boljem poznavanju otočnog dijela Kvarnera. Stoga je već 1961. godine, u samom gradu Krku, na položaju Šinigoj (sl. 15), zaštitno istražila nekoliko devastiranih grobova čija građa potječe iz mlađeg željeznog doba.<sup>107</sup> Uslijedilo je zaštitno istraživanje na gradini Zagrajine-Svilov 1965. godine, gdje su dokumentirani megalitski bedemi, a samom je površinom tako gradina postala najveće naselje poslije onog na Gračišću.<sup>108</sup> Građa koja je prikupljena iz okolnih razorenih tumula pohranjena je u ZFS na Košljunu. Napokon, zaštitno je istražila i devastirani tumul iz kasnog brončanog doba na položaju Šula kod Dobrinja, 1966. godine (sl. 15).<sup>109</sup> Na taj se nalaz nadovezala i zaštitnim istraživačkim radovima na otoku Rabu, pa je na Gromačici kod Lopara 1967. godine istražila i poveći tumul sa 9 grobova organiziranih uokolo središnjeg i najvažnijeg groba (sl. 17).<sup>110</sup> Taj je izniman nalaz u stručnoj literaturi više puta obrađivan,<sup>111</sup> a nakon osorskog tumula kod Sv. Marije postao je drugi moderno istraživani lokalitet nekropole pod tumulima. Važno je svakako istaknuti da je svu prikupljenu građu iz navedenih istraživanja R. Matejčić ažurno objavljivala sa svom potrebnom dokumentacijom, katalozima i crtežima, a ona se danas najvećim dijelom nalazi pohranjena u PPMHP u Rijeci.

Međutim, gradine i tumule temeljito je na cijelom području kvarnerskog bazena istraživao tek Ranko Starac, također kustos u PPMHP u Rijeci. Njegovim će radom biti zato obilježene 90-te godine 20. i prva desetljeća 21. stoljeća. Neka je od svojih zapažanja predstavio 1992. godine u tekstu kataloga izložbe *Izbor iz arheološke građe Kvarnerskog područja*. U tom je tekstu autor naveo prapovijesne gradine Kalvariju, Stupnjak, Sv. križ (Srdoči),

above Martinšćica (fig. 7).<sup>114</sup> One of his major contributions is also the research of cave sites on the eastern fringes of Istria, among which the Oporovina cave above Medveja and Podosojna peć cave above Mošćenička Draga must be singled out (fig. 2).<sup>115</sup>

Since the 1990s the area of Vinodol has actually been Starac's primary area of interest (fig. 2) that mainly included the hinterland of Crikvenica where the partly destroyed hill-fort of Kotor was located. He excavated several test trenches on the locality of Godač on Kotor.<sup>116</sup> Towards the hinterland he documented a series of tumuli – as for example those of Vele Gromače, Gradine, Obla, Zajam and several others among which the tumulus from Stolnić stands out due to the interesting finds dated to the Late Bronze Age.<sup>117</sup> In addition, valuable information is being provided by his research, still under way, on the hill-fort of Čelo on the peninsula of Havišće near Jadranovo below which, in the Lokvina Bay, several prehistoric finds were discovered,<sup>118</sup> in Bakar which was also an important prehistoric hill-fort with rich necropolises in the vicinity,<sup>119</sup> and all the way to the hill fort of Osap near Novi Vinodolski.<sup>120</sup> During the surveys of this area, R. Starac located several smaller hill-forts or watchtowers and tumuli, among which the most important are the hill-forts of Praputnjak, Gradišće near Drivenik with the Vela Stražnica tumulus nearby, the hill-fort of Sv. Kuzam and Sopalj above Dramalj, the hill-fort of Drenin and Sv. Juraj above Selce, the bay of Stari porat near the Kačjak peninsula and many others (fig. 2). All the observations made only confirm Starac's claim that a prehistoric settlement must have existed at the mouth of Dubračina, even prior to the establishment of *Ad Turres* (Crikvenica), with a port that directly communicated with the eastern part of the island of Krk that was densely covered with hill forts.

<sup>107</sup> Matejčić 1963; Žic-Rokov 1962: 36-37.

<sup>108</sup> Matejčić 1965.

<sup>109</sup> Matejčić 1966.

<sup>110</sup> Matejčić 1968.

<sup>111</sup> Npr. Harding 1995; Mihovilić 2001b.

<sup>114</sup> Starac 2006a.

<sup>115</sup> Starac 1988; Starac 1994.

<sup>116</sup> Starac 2007.

<sup>117</sup> Starac 2004: 165-172.

<sup>118</sup> Starac 2002: 190-192.

<sup>119</sup> Starac 2005.

<sup>120</sup> Ružić 1985.

za koje tvrdi da više ne postoje, zatim Sv. križ iznad Martinšćice, Veli vrh iznad Pulca te gradinu Velu stražu.<sup>112</sup> Potom se R. Starac još jednom, 1996. godine, osvrnuo na riječke gradine, kada im dodaje gradine Solin i Orlac.<sup>113</sup> Gradinu Sv. Križ iznad Martinšćice sondažno će i na dijelovima istraživati posljednjih godina (sl. 7).<sup>114</sup> Važan doprinos ostvario je i arheološkim istraživanjima u špiljama istočnih obronaka Učke, u Oporovini iznad Medveje i Podosojnoj peći iznad Mošćeničke Drage (sl. 2).<sup>115</sup>

No područje je Vinodola zapravo prava interesna regija njegovih istraživanja još od 90-ih godina. Posebno se to odnosi na crikveničko zaleđe prostora Kotora gdje se nalazilo, danas dijelom uništeno, gradinsko naselje. Na položaju Godač na samom Kotoru vršit će i sondažna iskopavanja.<sup>116</sup> Prema zaleđu dokumentirao je niz tumula, kao npr. Vele Gromače, Gradine, Obla, Zajam itd., ali je rezultatima istupao, i ovdje obrađen, tumul iz Stolniča s paljevinskim ukopom koji je pružio zanimljivu građu iz kasnog brončanoga doba.<sup>117</sup> Nadalje, vrijedne podatke pružaju autorova istraživanja, koja su i dalje u tijeku, gradine Čelo na poluotoku Havišće kod Jadranova, podno koje je u uvali Lokvina također zabilježeno nekoliko prapovijesnih nalaza,<sup>118</sup> na prostoru Bakra, koji je također bio znamenito i važno gradinsko naselje s bogatim nekropolama,<sup>119</sup> pa sve do gradine Osap kod Novog Vinodolskog.<sup>120</sup> Na tom je potezu R. Starac zabilježio niz manjih gradina, tzv. osmatračnica i tumula, a najvažnija su gradina Praputnjak, Gradišće kod Drivenika s tumulom Vela Stražnica u njezinoj blizini, gradine Sv. Kuzam i Sopalj iznad Dramlja, gradina Drenin te gradina Sv. Juraj iznad Selca, zatim uvala Stari porat kod poluotoka Kačjak, i dr. (sl. 2). Sve to slijedi samo autorovu ispravnom zaključku kako je na ušću Dubračine trebalo biti formirano naselje s pristaništem i prije osnivanja *Ad Turres* (Crikvenice), koje je izravno i neposredno komuniciralo s istočnim, gradinama vrlo napučenim predjelom otoka Krka.

Isti je autor stoga, logično, istraživao i objavio znatan dio zaštitnih istraživanja na otoku Krku, ispred svega gradinu Keršovani vrh iznad Garice, koja će tek analizom gradiva pružiti zanimljive rezultate.<sup>121</sup> Zatim tu su brojni prikupljeni predmeti iz tumula u Sužanu, Trojni, Puntu-Batovo, Zagrajine i dr. (sl. 2; 15).

Znatno su se slabijeg intenziteta i zanimanja istraživali otoci Rab i Pag. Pa ipak, s otoka Paga Šime Batović objavljuje tzv. grobne nalaze iz starijeg željeznog doba iz Dabovih stanova na poluotoku Lunu. Dobrim dijelom rekognoscira čitavo područje Novalje, kao i otoka Paga u cjelini. S istim se namjerama angažira i na otoku Rabu, gdje zahvaljujući njegovom iscrpnijem izvješću topografski poznajemo gradine na Kašetlini na Loparu, Trbušnjaku, Pećinama, Kužekinom i poneke druge manje gradine i tumule, kao i manji dio građe koju je pri tome sakupio (sl. 2; 17).<sup>122</sup> U tom se pravcu, na zapažanja Š. Batovića, nadovezuje i Zdenko Brusić koji je proveo nekoliko rekognosciranja i probnih istraživanja na gradini Kašetlini na Loparu i na Gromačici, odakle je prikupljenu građu, smještenu vremenski u

<sup>112</sup> Starac 1992.

<sup>113</sup> Starac 1996.

<sup>114</sup> Starac 2006a.

<sup>115</sup> Starac 1988; Starac 1994.

<sup>116</sup> Starac 2007.

<sup>117</sup> Starac 2004: 165-172.

<sup>118</sup> Starac 2002: 190-192.

<sup>119</sup> Starac 2005.

<sup>120</sup> Ružić 1985.

<sup>121</sup> Starac 2006b.

<sup>122</sup> Batović 1987c.



Slika 16. Radmila Matejčić.

Figure 16. Radmila Matejčić.

Starac also conducted research and published the results of his rescue excavations on the island of Krk – mostly on the hill-fort of Keršovani vrh above Garica which, once sorted out and analysed, will surely provide interesting results.<sup>121</sup> There were also numerous other finds collected on the tumuli in Sužan, Trojina, Punat-Batovo, Zagrajine and others (fig. 2; 15).

Much less research was conducted on the islands of Rab and Pag. However, from Pag the so called grave goods dated to the Early Iron Age originating from the site of Dabovi stanovi on the peninsula of Lun were presented by Š. Batović. Since he surveyed the whole territory of Novalja and the island of Pag itself, he extended his undertaking also to the island of Rab and due to this project, topographical data are available on the hill-forts of Kašetlina on Lopar, Trbušnjak, Pećine, Kužekino and several other smaller hill-forts and tumuli on which he gathered a small collection of archaeological finds (fig. 2; 17).<sup>122</sup> The work of Š. Batović was continued by Zdenko Brusić who surveyed and excavated several test trenches on the hill-forts of Kašetlina on Lopar and on Gromačica (fig. 17). Finds from the latter, dated into the final phase of the Early Iron Age were published shortly afterwards.<sup>123</sup> A few years later, Dunja Glogović published the finds which allegedly originate from the graves on the necropolis on Vidasovi stanovi on the Lun peninsula on the island of Pag and are stored in the sacral collection *Stomorica* in Novalja.<sup>124</sup> From both islands a larger number of items, mostly jewelry, from the Late Bronze


<sup>121</sup> Starac 2006b.

<sup>122</sup> Batović 1987c.

<sup>123</sup> Brusić 1988.

<sup>124</sup> Glogović 1991.





Slika 17. Sjeverni dio otoka Raba, Lopar s označenim položajem nalazišta (▲).

Figure 17. Lopar – the north part of the island Rab with indicated archaeological sites (▲).

mlađu fazu starijeg željeznog doba, uskoro i objavio.<sup>123</sup> Nedugo za time Dunja Glogović publicirala je i građu koja, navodno, potječe iz grobova/nekropole iz Vidasovih stanova, također s Luna na Pagu, a koja se čuva u sakralnoj zbirci *Stomorica* u Novalji.<sup>124</sup> Sve zajedno, s ta dva otoka, do sada je prikupljen i struci poznat poveći izbor nakitnih predmeta nošnje koji se smještaju u vrijeme kasnog brončanog i starijeg željeznog doba.

Što se pak cresko-lošinjskog otočja tiče, nekoliko preglednih radova s osnovnim topografskim i povijesnim, već dobro poznatim činjenicama, ponudila je Jasminka Ćus-Rukonić,<sup>125</sup> tadašnja kustosa u creskom i lošinjskom Muzeju, kao i tek manji izbor građe iz Arheološke zbirke Osora.<sup>126</sup> Glede topografskog i tipološkog poznavanja gradinskih naselja na priobalnom potezu od Rijeke do Novog Vinodolskog, ali isto tako i na cresko-lošinjskom otočju, posebno treba izdvojiti sintetske radove Nikole Stražičića,<sup>127</sup> koji je sustavno pregledavao teren, ubicirao stara i nova nalazišta, prikupljao brojnu, uglavnom keramičku građu.

Međutim, "slika" Kvarnera za brončanog i željeznog doba kreirana je u brojnim studijama i stručnim radovima koje je potpisivao Šime Batović.<sup>128</sup> U njima je građa bez odstupanja konvencionalno interpretirana, svedena na nabranje ili na ubranje u opće prihvaćene tipološke i kronološke koncepte o Liburnima i Liburniji, s

and Early Iron Ages has been discovered and published so far.

As far as the Cres–Lošinj archipelago is concerned, several works containing basic historical and topographical information, already well known, were published by Jasminka Ćus-Rukonić.<sup>125</sup> Working as a curator in the Museum of Cres and Lošinj, she published a minor section of finds from the Osor archaeological collection.<sup>126</sup>

When considering the topographical and typological classification of hill forts on the coastal area between Rijeka and Novi Vinodolski, as well as on the archipelago of Cres and Lošinj, the synthetic publications by Nikola Stražičić should be singled out.<sup>127</sup> He surveyed the area in a systematic way, locating old and new sites and collecting surface finds, mainly consisting of pottery.

However, the general "picture" of Kvarner in the Bronze and Iron Ages was created in numerous studies and professional articles written by Šime Batović,<sup>128</sup> where archaeological finds were conventionally interpreted, reduced to counting the finds and placing them into the accepted typological and chronological frameworks of the Liburnian culture in Liburnia noting that the Kvarner area was a marginal territory, where different influences and cultures mixed.

The Kvarner material received its "image" in the works by Dunja Glogović which in her systematic elaboration, typological and chronological determination and scientific approach left a "mark" on the history of Kvarner. It was in her book that the scientific community was

<sup>123</sup> Brusić 1988.

<sup>124</sup> Glogović 1991.

<sup>125</sup> Ćus-Rukonić 1982; Ćus-Rukonić 1998; Ćus-Rukonić 2005.

<sup>126</sup> Ćus-Rukonić 1981; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989.

<sup>127</sup> Stražičić 1981; Stražičić 1996b; Stražičić 1998.

<sup>128</sup> Batović 1980; Batović 1982; Batović 1983; Batović 1987a; Batović 1987c; Batović 2003 – sa starijom literaturom.

<sup>125</sup> Ćus-Rukonić 1982; Ćus-Rukonić 1998; Ćus-Rukonić 2005.

<sup>126</sup> Ćus-Rukonić 1981; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989.

<sup>127</sup> Stražičić 1981; Stražičić 1996b; Stražičić 1998.

<sup>128</sup> Batović 1980; Batović 1982; Batović 1983; Batović 1987a; Batović 1987c; Batović 2003 – with previous literature.

naglaskom da je Kvarner bio rubno područje u kome su se miješali različiti utjecaji i kulture.

Svoje je "obličje" kvarnerska građa ipak dobila u radovima Dunje Glogović koja je sustavnim obrađivanjem, tipološko-kronološkim analiziranjem i znanstvenim pristupom neizbrisivo "obilježila" povijest Kvarnera. U svojoj je monografskoj publikaciji prvi put široj znanstvenoj i stručnoj javnosti na jednome mjestu predstavila kvarnerska naselja i nekropole, kao i odabrani, reprezentativni izbor iz sačuvane materijalne ostavštine u okviru liburnske kulture od kasnog brončanog do mlađeg željeznog doba. Najveći broj fibula zastupljen je i u katalogu serije *Prähistorische Bronzefunde*, u kojem je ista autorica predstavila prapovijesne fibule s prostora čitavog hrvatskog priobalja.<sup>129</sup>

Tijekom druge polovine 20. stoljeća provedena su, dakle, ne brojna, ali prva metodološki moderno iskopavana i primjereno objavljena istraživanja. Rezultati koji su tada bili ostvareni bili su izuzetno zanimljivi i atraktivni široj znanstvenoj publici. Unatoč tomu, nikakva se istraživanja, i pored svih nastojanja, nisu uspjela sustavno provoditi na pojedinim nalazištima, već su ona isključivo ostala na razini topografskih i eventualno tipoloških poznavanja. Razvidno je kako su se istraživački radovi u poslijeratnim desetljećima odvijali najvećim intenzitetom i znanstvenim elanom, dok je s godinama interes za izučavanje tog područja, barem kada je vrijeme brončanog i željeznog doba u pitanju, opadao, i uglavnom su ga provodili arheolozi iz nadležnih, regionalnih institucija ponajviše u okviru zaštitnih istraživačkih radova. Pa ipak, građa koja je u proteklih dvadesetak godina prikupljena, bilo terenski, bilo arhivski po depoima pojedinih muzeja i zbirki, znatno je nadopunila stanje koje je bilo zaokruženo 1989. godine. Kao i tada, tako i u ovoj prilici ponajmanje je građe analizirano iz istraživanja naselja ili prikupljeno pojedinačno iz različitih medija, a ponajviše je obuhvaćeno one koja potječe iz poznatih nekropola i tumula. Kao takva čini osnovu ove studije u novom kritičkom vrednovanju i predloženom mogućem interpretiranju.

able to get information for the first time about the settlements and necropolis and to see selected representative examples of the preserved archaeological heritage dating from the end of the Late Bronze Age until the end of the Late Iron Age of the Liburnian cultural group. The largest number of fibulae was presented in the catalogue of her volume of *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* which was dedicated to prehistoric fibulae from the whole territory of the Croatian coast.<sup>129</sup>

The first methodologically modern excavations were conducted during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Although not numerous, the results obtained from such systematic necropolis excavations proved to be of immense interest to the larger scientific community. Despite that, no further systematic excavations were conducted on the settlements and the research was limited to the topographical recognition and a possible typological determination of the sites. Although research was intensive and full of eagerness in the first post-World War II decades, as time passed by, the interest in researching the Bronze and Iron Ages on this territory ceased. It mainly remained an occupation for archaeologists working in regional institutions and in charge of rescue excavations. Still, finds collected during the last two decades, either in the fields or in the depots of individual museums and collections, significantly supplemented the knowledge, already shaped in 1989, on the cultural history of the region. However, like in the past, also on that occasion, only the smallest amount of material coming from settlements or various circumstances of discovery has been analysed, whereas most of the material covered came from known necropoles and tumuli (fig. 2; 15; 17). Therefore, the given material represents the base of the present study containing new approaches to the critical evaluation and the suggested interpretation of the archaeological heritage of the Kvarner area.

<sup>129</sup> Glogović 1982; Glogović 1987; Glogović 1988; Glogović 1989; Glogović 1991; Glogović 1993; Glogović 2003.

<sup>129</sup> Glogović 1982; Glogović 1987; Glogović 1988; Glogović 1989; Glogović 1991; Glogović 1993; Glogović 2003.



## Tipološka klasifikacija, kronološka determinacija, kulturološka interpretacija<sup>130</sup>

Tipološka klasifikacija, kronološka determinacija te moguća kulturološka interpretacija u ovome obliku i prostornosti istraživanja otpočet će sa sačuvanom materijalnom ostavštinom koja se u tehnološkom poimanju analizira kao dijelom kasnog brončanog doba. Datacijski će se slijediti negdje već od 13./12. stoljeća pr. Kr.,<sup>131</sup> kada su se kulturološki u najvećoj mogućoj mjeri do tada ispreplitali svjetovi prapovijesne Europe. "Prvo zlatno doba Europe", a posebno njegov "suton", nije mogao ni na koji način zaobići njezin integralni dio – Kvarner. Bilo bi o tome suvišno raspravljati i uslijed naših opravdavanja o slaboj istraženosti. Kasno je brončano doba – novo doba, bitno drugačije od dotadašnjih, obilježeno vrtoglavih tehnološkim napretkom, ponajprije metalurgijom bronce, koja je osim prijelomnih tehnoloških, tehničkih i komunikacijskih dostignuća, dovela do korjenitih društvenih i ideoloških promjena u gotovo svim oblicima društvenih manifestacija. Snabdijevanje metalima, na ovaj ili onaj način, na bližim ili najudaljenijim relacijama, uvjetovalo je stvaranje tzv. globalne povezanosti na razmeđu svjetova, upravo onda kada je "Zeus odlučio prekinuti agoniju svojih običnih smrtnika brončanoga vremena".<sup>132</sup>

"Obični su se smrtnici ipak toliko ogrezli o potrebu za gomilanjem bogatstava", da se i sukladno toj želji potreba za metalom stalno povećavala. Ali, kao i za mnoge druge prostore, tako je i za kvarnerski bazen najveća poteškoća bila upravo nabava i dopremanje potrebitih sirovina. No i ne samo njih. U taj su optok uklopljeni i svi oni prestižni predmeti koji su bili znakovni supstitut za prepoznavanje i identifikaciju simbola u sustavu vrijednosti različitih kulturnih i društvenih poredaka, kako u fizičkim tako i u bezbrojnim duhovnim aspektima. A oni su pak nerijetko bili toliko udaljeni da je njihovo međusobno povezivanje, izravno razumijevanje i određen statusni sklad naprosto zapanjujući. Formiranje, dakle, specifičnosti globalnog, univerzalnog karaktera prostranog europskog kopna, potenciralo je i afirmiralo vlastitu, prepoznatljivu realiziranost, koju najčešće interpretiramo kao regionalnu pojavu ili odgovor na sveopći fenomenološki poticaj. Naravno da

<sup>130</sup> Sintagma je djelomično preuzeta od Renata Peronia (1998: *Classificazione tipologica, seriazione cronologica, distribuzione geografica*).

<sup>131</sup> Budući da se radnja čitave kronologije odvija u stoljećima prije Krista, u daljnjem se tekstu izostavlja ta kratica, a kada je to potrebno ističe se kratica koja obuhvaća vrijeme poslije Krista (*pos. Kr.*).

<sup>132</sup> Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 135-170.

## Typological classification, chronological determination and cultural interpretation<sup>130</sup>

The typological classification, chronological determination and a possible cultural interpretation in the present form and of the territory under examination will start by reviewing the preserved material remains analysed in terms of their technological conception as belonging to the Late Bronze Age. Chronologically, the process will be traced back as early as the 13<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries BC,<sup>131</sup> when the different worlds of Prehistoric Europe became culturally intertwined to the largest possible degree until then. "The first Golden Age of Europe" and in particular its "sunset" could not circumvent its integral part – the Kvarner Gulf and there is no point in contesting it, despite our justifications concerning the poor state of research. The Late Bronze Age is a new period – essentially different from the preceding ones, and marked by exceptional technological progress. Beside the ground-breaking technological, technical and communicational achievements, it was first of all the progress in the metallurgy of bronze which led to radical social and ideological changes in almost all forms of societies. Supply with metals, in any way whatsoever, by means of short or long distance trade, brought about the creation of a global connection at the crossroads of worlds at the very moment when "Zeus decided to interrupt the agony of common mortals of the Bronze Age".<sup>132</sup>

"Since common mortals sank so deeply into the greed to scramble for wealth", the need for metal constantly increased. Still, the major problem for the Kvarner Gulf, as for many other regions, was the acquisition and delivery of needed raw materials, and not only of raw materials, but also of such prestigious artefacts which represented substitutes for recognizing and identifying symbols within the scale value in different forms of cultural and social orders – both with regard to material and countless spiritual aspects. However, they were often so distant that their mutual connections, direct understanding and a precise determination of social status was simply shocking. The creations of this specific global and universal character of the European land mass intensified and affirmed its own recognizable productions, which were mostly interpreted as regional

<sup>130</sup> The syntagma has been partly taken over from Renato Peroni (1998 *Classificazione tipologica, seriazione cronologica, distribuzione geografica*).

<sup>131</sup> Since the chronology refers to the centuries BC, the abbreviation has been mostly omitted. When the period AD is concerned, the respective abbreviation has been used.

<sup>132</sup> Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 135-170.

prostor Kvarnera nije bio iz toga izuzet i, kako će nam pokazati sama analiza i interpretacija preostale materijalne građe, vrlo se brzo prepoznaje samosvojni, mjesni razvitak uočljivo različit od okolnih područja. Nedvojbeno posrednička geostrateška pozicija Kvarnera (sl. 1-2) odigrala je tako ključnu ulogu u primanju i davanju, u optjecaju i komunikacijskoj mreži ideja, uzora i djela njegova kulturno-povijesnog razvitka.

Tako je s jedne strane povezanost s jugoistočnoalpskom i panonskom kulturom polja sa žarama (KPŽ)<sup>133</sup> bila izrazita i stalna, i neće se samo ogledati u sačuvanoj građi, nego i u uvođenju obreda spaljivanja pokojnika, što se za sada zrcali na sve većem broju pojedinih primjera, i što doista možemo pripisati posljedici nedovoljne ili neadekvatne istraženosti. S druge strane, Kvarner je morem, tzv. globalnom mrežom, još od znatno starijih vremena, ali ponajviše od kasnog brončanog doba, povezan s prostorom Apeninskog poluotoka i njegovih kultura, odnosno posredno ili neposredno s egejskim kulturno-interesnim prostorom u najširem smislu te riječi, koji se tako provlači sve do levantskog "predziđa" bliskoistočnih civilizacija. Sprega njihovih potreba i želja manifestirala se u stvaranju ogromne kulturne *koiné*, povezanosti sredozemnih i kontinentalnih područja Europe, koja je upravo očekivano ostavila neizbrisiv trag i na području Kvarnera. Zbog toga se čitava radnja oslanja na relativnu kronologiju ponuđenu za navedene prostore, s vertikalom u srednjoeuropskom kronološkom sustavu, modificiranom i nadopunjenom, novim spoznajama i datacijskim pomacima prema Hermann Müller-Karpeu.<sup>134</sup> Njoj su prilagođavane i najnovije kronologije za italjsko kopno koje, nadalje, upravo u tim najstarijim i najupitnijim vremenima, do povijesnog momenta kolonizacije njihova područja,<sup>135</sup> nastoje biti usklađivane, manje ili više uspješno, s egejskim prostorom. U tome svemu nastojala se slijediti i moguća nit novih relevantnih podataka dobivenih radiokarbonskim ili dendrokronološkim datiranjem, a koja su za predmetno područje isključivo od tipološkog, tj. stilskog značenja. Tako ćemo u relativnom poimanju pratiti razvoj, zapravo preostale nam mozaičke kockice u cilju, koji ne opravdava sredstvo, dobivanja barem djelomične slike življenja kroz materijalnu ostavštinu od tzv. *starije faze KPŽ*, tj. od BrD/HaA horizonta, odnosno od italjskog horizonta *Bronzo recente/finale* (BR/BF), koji su vremenski bili sukladni s *kasno heladskim III C* razdobljem (KHIII C).

Razlog takvog odabira stoga je gotovo jasan i, moglo bi se reći, predvidljiv. Naime, od tog će se vremena, poglavito od mlađe faze kasnog brončanog doba, u formativnim procesima organizacija zajednica i/ili većih srodnih skupina, neprekinuti način življenja i razvijanja moći pratiti sve do sjedinjenja etničkih grupacija, atribuiranih u pisanim povijesnim vrelima već od starijeg željeznog doba.

phenomena or as responses to general ideals. Of course, the Kvarner area was no exception here, which can be shown by the analysis and interpretation of discovered findings, where an original, local development differing from the surrounding areas can be identified very quickly. Undoubtedly, the mediating geostrategic position of Kvarner played a key role in the process of giving and receiving, in the circulation and communication of ideas, models and parts of its cultural and historical development.

On the one hand the connection to the south-eastern Alpine and Pannonian Urnfield culture was constant and well-defined, which is reflected in the preserved artefacts but also in the introduction of the habit of cremating the deceased that can be observed only in a few cases - most likely due to the insufficient and inadequate state of research. On the other hand, the Kvarner Gulf with its global sea routes has been connected since ancient times, mostly since the Late Bronze Age, to the territory of the Apennine peninsula and its cultures, i.e. directly or indirectly with the Aegean cultural circle in the broadest sense, which stretches up to the Levantine entrance hall to the great civilizations of the Near East. The union of their needs and desires was expressed in the creation of an immense cultural *koiné*, a connection of the Mediterranean and continental areas of Europe, which left, as expected, inerasable traces on the Kvarner territory. Consequently, the whole presentation is linked to the relative chronologies of those areas with a base in the central European chronological system by Hermann Müller-Karpe, modified and supplemented with new results and dating.<sup>133</sup> This chronology is also the framework on which the latest chronologies elaborated for the Italian mainland rely, and which tend to be more or less successfully synchronized with the Aegean area exactly with regard to the earliest and most disputable periods until the moment of colonization of their territory<sup>134</sup>. In doing so, also a possible new perspective of new relevant information obtained by absolute radiocarbon and dendrochronological dating was followed despite the fact that with regard to the matter under examination such methods can only provide information of stylistic or typological importance. Therefore, life, or actually the remaining mosaic pieces of a broader picture will be observed through the analysis of the partial picture consisting of material remains from the period dating back to the beginning of the Early Urnfield culture, i.e. from the BrD/HaA horizon, or, in other words, the Italian horizon *Bronzo recente/finale* (BR/BF),<sup>135</sup> which are chronologically adjusted to the *Late Helladic III C* period (LHIII C).

The major reason for this selection is almost obvious and can be easily anticipated. In fact, it is from that period, in particular from the younger phase of the Late Bronze Age (HaA2/B1), that the formative processes in the organization of communities and/or larger social groups can be followed as continuous and uninterrupted ways of life and evolutions of power until the unification of ethnic groups – a process which started already in the Early Iron Age as documented by historic writings.

<sup>133</sup> U zagradama su navedene uobičajene kratice koje će se dalje koristiti u tekstu.

<sup>134</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959; Müller-Karpe 1974.

<sup>135</sup> Npr. zbornik *Mediterranea I* iz 2005. posvećen je raspravama na tu temu; usp. Nijboer et al 2000; Trachsel 2004; Zanini, Martinelli 2005; Nijboer, Plicht 2008; Pare 2008; Nijboer 2010 i br. drugi.

<sup>133</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959; Müller-Karpe 1974.

<sup>134</sup> For example the volume *Mediterranea I* from 2005 concerns discussions of this kind. Compare also Nijboer et al 2000; Trachsel 2004; Zanini, Martinelli 2005; Nijboer, Plicht 2008; Pare 2008; Nijboer 2010 and many others.

<sup>135</sup> Standard abbreviations which will be used in the text are given in brackets.

## Egzotizmi i lokalizmi kulturne koiné

Na prostoru kvarnerskog bazena, unatoč činjenici što sirovinskog materijala za preradu bronce nema, postojeći predmeti, koji su obilježili vrijeme kasnog brončanog doba, najvećim dijelom pripadaju u one luksuza i prestiža. Tumačeni kao egzotizmi ili alohtone forme, najčešće prema modelu tzv. "lanac prestiža",<sup>136</sup> po kojem kvantitativno opadanje dobara od točke podrijetla do točke potrošača nije regularno, ali ima znatne viškove kod sekundarnih centara proizvodnje i/ili distribucije. S obzirom na položaj, na Kvarner su pristizali različiti "komunikacijski" putovi i sa "Sjevera" i s "Juga", pa su takvi centri ondje morali postojati, zasigurno na Osoru i najvjerojatnije na južnom dijelu otoka Krka, na relaciji Krk-Baška. Upravo se u njima, u određenim procesima znanja i vještina, formirali i svojstveni lokalizmi koji su postali simboličke i identifikacijske oznake ili vrijednosti prepoznavanja potpuno izgrađenog identiteta (znanja, mogućnosti, snage i kreativnog dosega) čitave regije u široj, ali istovremenoj kulturnoj mreži značenja.<sup>137</sup>

## O fibulama sa dva dugmeta na luku i "Sredozemnoj" koiné

Na prostoru obala Jadranskog mora znakovita je uloga pripala lučnim fibulama sa dva dugmeta na luku, posebno u kombinaciji s narukvicama, bilo dvoslivnog presjeka bilo manšetastog tipa, i s jantarnim perlama tipa Tiryns i Allumiere. Gotovo identičan reper-toar znan je iz već dobro poznatih grobova Vrsi i Bismatove, a bit će to ujedno i svojstven oblik nakita poznatog iz Baške te općenito s otoka Krka i kvarnerskog priobalja. Fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku, sa svim brojnim lokalnim varijantama, u submikensko su vrijeme vrlo široko rasprostranjene od istočnog Mediterana do sjevernog jadranskog bazena i dalje sve do švicarskih Alpa (sl. 18).<sup>138</sup> Vjerojatno su se zbog svoje jednostavnosti, ali i funkcionalnosti,<sup>139</sup> dugo koristile, a nove apsolutne datacije iz egejskog prostora (Pilona, grob 4, Elateia, grob 12 itd.) jasno potvrđuju i njihovu vodeću ulogu u KHIIIC razdoblju s mogućnošću trajanja sve do protogeometrijskog doba.<sup>140</sup> Na Kvarneru se, uostalom kao i na prostoru istočne obale Jadrana, uvijek nalaze u zadanoj asocijaciji, kako je rečeno, s navedenim tipovima narukvicama, ali i s iglom lukovičaste glavice i tordiranoga vrata.<sup>141</sup> To izravno argumentira primjer inventara iz groba tumula u Stolničju (kat. 1-8).<sup>142</sup> Riječ je o grupi nakitnih oblika, u potpunosti namjerno fragmentiranih, skupa s keramičkim priložima, obilježavajući tako iznimno bogat paljevinski ukop (sl. 19). Antropološkom analizom ustanovljeno je kako je riječ o dvojnog ukopu odraslog muškarca i djeteta mlađe dobi.<sup>143</sup>

Pridružiti mu se može i tzv. "rekonstruirani grob" iz Baške s većim brojem jantarnih perli (kat. 10-11). One su nesumnjivo činile dio inventara natprosječno bogatog groba, već dijelom uništenog,

## Exoticisms and localisms of the cultural koiné

Despite the lack of raw materials for the production of bronze, Kvarner territory artefacts mostly belong to the group of luxurious and prestigious finds. They have been explained as exotic or foreign forms, mostly following the model of the so called "chain of prestige",<sup>136</sup> according to which the quantitative decrease of goods from the point of origin to the point of consumption is not regular, but has observable surpluses in secondary centres of production and /or distribution. In respect to its geostrategic position, the Kvarner was a region of influx, a meeting point of different "communication" routes from the "north" and the "south". Therefore, such secondary centres existed here, in Osor for sure and most probably in the southern part of the island of Krk, as well as on the Krk – Baška line. It was exactly in such centres, in specific knowledge and skills processes, that single local features appeared which became symbols and identification markers or values of recognition of a completely formed identity (knowledge, possibilities, force and creative scope) of the whole region in a broader but simultaneous cultural network of meaning.<sup>137</sup>

## On fibulae with two knobs on the bow and the "Mediterranean" koiné

In the area around the Adriatic the appearance of bowed fibulae with two knobs on the bow is significant, in particular when they occur in combination with a bracelet with a double-pitch or "V"-shaped cross-section, ribbed cuff-shaped bracelets and amber beads of the Tiryns and Allumiere type. An almost identical grave inventory is known from previously compared graves, like those from Vrsi or Bismantova, and will be found also in Baška and generally on the island of Krk and the coastal area of the Kvarner. Fibulae with two knobs on the bow, with their many local groups are widely distributed in the sub-Mycenaean period stretching from the eastern Mediterranean to the northern part of the Adriatic Basin and further on all the way to the Alps in Switzerland (fig. 18).<sup>138</sup> Due to their simplicity interweaved with functionality<sup>139</sup> they were used for a long time and their absolute dating from the Aegean area (Pilona, grave 4; Elateia, grave 12 etc.) demonstrated their leading role in the LHIIIC period with a possible duration in the protogeometric period.<sup>140</sup> In the Kvarner area, as on the territory of the eastern Adriatic coast, they appear in a specific combination – together with bracelets with a double-pitch cross-section and/or ribbed cuff-shaped bracelets and pins with an onion-shaped head and a twisted neck.<sup>141</sup> This directly accounts for the example of the inventory of the grave tumulus in Stolnič (cat. 1-8),<sup>142</sup> in which deliberately fragmented jewelry items were discovered together with the pottery, marking an extremely wealthy cremation grave (fig. 19). Anthropological analyses of the charred bone remains showed that it

<sup>136</sup> Renfrew, Bahn 2004: 361-364.

<sup>137</sup> Gramsch, Meier 2013.

<sup>138</sup> Teržan 2007: 160-162.

<sup>139</sup> Za neke fibule koje odskauču svojim velikim dimenzijama, funkcionalnost nije mogla biti primarna. Zasigurno je i sama veličina odražavala neko pravilo nošenja nošnje?

<sup>140</sup> Jung 2006: 193; Teržan 2007: 160-161.

<sup>141</sup> Čović 1971: 313-315; Bietti Sestieri, Lo Schiavo 1976: Fig. 16; Batović 1976: 21-25; Glogović 1987: 74-82, T. 1; Glogović 2003: 17-21; Teržan 1984a: 111; Teržan 1995: 353-360, Abb. 23; Teržan 2007: 161; Pare 1998: 328-329, Abb. 15.

<sup>142</sup> Blečić 2009: 144, Fig. 1; Blečić Kavur 2011: 54-56, Fig. 6.

<sup>143</sup> Kružić 2013.

<sup>136</sup> Renfrew, Bahn 2004: 361-364.

<sup>137</sup> Gramsch, Meier 2013.

<sup>138</sup> Teržan 2007: 160-162.

<sup>139</sup> Some fibulae, standing out in terms of size, their functionality could not have been their primary function. For sure the size itself reflected an inconceivable rule of wearing the attire?

<sup>140</sup> Jung 2006: 193; Teržan 2007: 160-161.

<sup>141</sup> Čović 1971: 313-315; Bietti Sestieri, Lo Schiavo 1976: Fig. 16; Batović 1976: 21-25; Glogović 1987: 74-82, T. 1; Glogović 2003: 17-21; Teržan 1984a: 111; Teržan 1995: 353-360, Abb. 23; Teržan 2007: 161; Pare 1998: 328-329, Abb. 15.

<sup>142</sup> Blečić 2009: 144, Fig. 1; Blečić Kavur 2011: 54-56, Fig. 6.



**Slika 18.** Pregledna karta rasprostiranja lučnih fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku bez tipološke podjele (nadopunjeno prema Peroni et al. 1980; Caner 1983; Pedde 2000; Teržan 2007; Lo Schiavo 2010).

**Figure 18.** Distribution map of the bow fibulae with two knobs on the bow, without typological distinction (supplemented after Peroni et al. 1980; Caner 1983; Pedde 2000; Teržan 2007; Lo Schiavo 2010).

kojeg je prikupio E. Nowotny prilikom istraživanja 1895. godine. Zahvaljujući arhivskim istraživanjima i vrijednim podacima iz NHMW, u cijelosti obrađenima i prikazanima od B. Mader, konačno se o perlama iz Baške može raspravljati smislenije i u priželjkivanim okolnostima.<sup>144</sup> Tako je gotovo na istom položaju sakupljen i niz od koštanih pločastih perli (kat. 12), zatim mnoštvo malih brončanih privjesaka-obruča tzv. *Ringgeld* (kat. 13), saltaleonea (kat. 15), ali i 18 komada narukvica dvoslivnog presjeka (kat. 14), velika lučna fibula, a nešto podalje i ostaci spaljenih ljudskih kostiju (sl. 19).<sup>145</sup> Već sam pogled na ispričanu građu stvara "sliku" grobnog inventara kakvog dobro poznajemo iz Vrsi (sl. 26), no gotovo je zapanjujuća podudarnost s repertoarom prestižnih nošnji znamenitih za grobove Frattesine i Bismantove (sl. 27-28). Stoga ne može biti nikakve sumnje de je nalaz iz Baške, točnije Drage Bašćanske, bio dijelom grobnog inventara kompleta prestižne ženske nošnje.

"Velika lučna fibula", hipotetski mišljeno, mogla je obilježavati i lučnu fibulu sa dva dugmeta na luku. No, i u oba primjera, kronološka se pozicija bitnije ne mijenja. Za razliku od tog rekonstruiranog bašćanskog slučaja, primjerak fibule iz Stolniča posve je konkretan. Naime, fibula ima masivan luk i veće, tanko profilirano dugme te karakterističan ukras urezanih geometrijskih motiva po luku (sl. 19: 1). Ujedno, to su i osnovna obilježja po kojima će se očitovati različitosti između pojedinih fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku istočnojadranskih varijanti. Budući da je razlika između japodskih i liburnskih primjeraka izvedena uočljivim odstupanjem kako

was a double burial of an adult male and a younger child.<sup>143</sup>

The so called "reconstructed grave" from Baška with a large number of amber beads (cat. 10-11) could be added to the abovementioned burials. They were undoubtedly part of the inventory of an extremely rich but partly destroyed grave whose inventory was collected by E. Nowotny during his research in 1895. Thanks to research activities in the archives and valuable information from the NHMW, collected and presented by B. Mader, the Baška beads can be discussed about in a sensible and in the desired circumstances.<sup>144</sup> She demonstrated that almost on the same location a string of flat bone beads was collected (cat. 12); a multitude of small bronze rings – the so called *Ringgeld* (cat. 13), a multitude of saltaleones (cat. 15) and also 18 bracelets with double-pitch cross-section (cat. 14), a large bow fibula and, a bit further away, also the remains of charred human bones (fig. 19).<sup>145</sup> Already slight glimpse to the finds creates the picture of a grave inventory which is already well known from Vrsi (fig. 26), but what is shocking is the similarity of the prestigious finds with those from the grave of famous sites like those of Frattesina and Bismantova (fig. 27-28). Therefore, there is no doubt that the finds from Baška (or Draga Bašćanska) were prestigious costume coming from a grave inventory of a female grave.

The mentioned "*large bow fibula*" could have been a bow fibula with two knobs on the bow, which does not change the chronological attribution of the inventory. Contrary to the reconstructed inventory


<sup>144</sup> Mader 2006: 260-264. B. Mader točno navodi kako su i F. Lo Schiavo i Š. Batović iz čitavog korpusa materijala koji se pod nazivom »Baška« čuva u NHMW, objavili samo izabrani dio građe. F. Lo Schiavo najvećim dijelom objelodanjuje građu iz istraživanja iste institucije 1912. godine, kojeg su poduzeli M. Abramić i J. Szombathy. Prilikom toga nisu se uvažavali niti, izgleda, koristili podatci sa signatura, inventarnih knjiga, izvještaja i ostalih arhivskih dokumenata koji se ondje čuvaju, a od neprocjenjive su važnosti za rekonstrukciju dogođenih istraživanja i istraženih predmeta.

<sup>145</sup> Mader 2006: 261-263, Abb. 16, 18.

<sup>143</sup> Kružić 2013.

<sup>144</sup> Mader 2006: 260-264. B. Mader warns that F. Lo Schiavo and Š. Batović published only a selected part of finds from the collection entitled "Baška" from the NHMW. F. Lo Schiavo published mostly finds discovered during the research of the Museum in 1912 which were undertaken by M. Abramić and J. Szombathy. During the preparation for the publication the information from the signatures, inventory books, reports and other documents in the archive were not consulted. Unfortunately, they were of invaluable importance for the research and discovered artifacts.


<sup>145</sup> Mader 2006: 261-263, Abb. 16, 18.



**Slika 19.** Predmeti iz dvojnog paljevinskog groba u Stolničju kod Crikvenice (kat. 1-8) i narukvica iz Godača (kat. 9).

**Figure 19.** Grave inventory from the double incineration grave in Stolnič near Crikvenica (cat. 1-8) and the bracelet from Godač (cat. 9).





**Slika 20.** Dio inventara "rekonstruiranog groba" iz Baške (crteži i idealna rekonstrukcija prema Lo Schiavo 1970; Batović 2003; Mader 2006).

**Figure 20.** A selection of finds from the "reconstructed grave" from Baška (drawings and ideal reconstruction after Lo Schiavo 1970; Batović 2003; Mader 2006).

dimenzijama tako i oblikovanjem opruge i nožice, uobičajeno su se liburnskoj varijanti pripisivale sve fibule s prostora Kvarnera.<sup>146</sup> Premda su one konstrukcijom i oblikovno nalik, ipak međusobno se i podosta razlikuju upravo po oblikovanju dugmeta i izvedbi geometrijskih ukrasa, na što je upozoravala već i D. Glogović.<sup>147</sup> Međutim, ne razrađujući predloženu tipologiju, kvarnerske nalaze određuje kao "sjevernu varijantu liburnskih fibula". Kod tih je fibula *kvarnerske varijante* u pravilu dugme naglašeno izvučeno, tanko i oštrobridno profilirano. To je upravo pravilo bez obzira na veličinu dugmeta. Nožica je najčešće šire polukružno, ali skladno raskovana, pokatkad ukrašena iskucavanjem. Samo na maloj fibuli iz Šule (kat. 220) postojano je dodatno ojačavanje opruge i igle fibule.<sup>148</sup> Poviše dugmeta, prema središtu luka, u pravilu se nalazi metopa ukrašena urezanim girlandama, dok je najviša točka luka u jednoj ili u dvije metope ukrašena šrafiranim rombovima ili motivima riblje kosti (kat. 1, 30-31, 45-46, 55-56, 174, 220, sl. 22). Posebna odlika kvarnerskih fibula je i njihovo različito ritualiziranje koje se, izuzev na polomljenoj fibuli iz Stolniča (sl. 19: 1), Novalje (sl. 23: 31) i Škocjana,<sup>149</sup> odražava i kod namjernog deformiranja na fibulama

from Baška, the present fibula from Stolnič is real. It has a massive bow and larger, thin profiled knobs with characteristic geometric motives incised on the bow (fig. 19: 1) – these are also the characteristics which will enable us to distinguish between different variants of fibulae from the Eastern Adriatic. Since the difference between examples from territory of the Japodi and Liburni was obvious due to differences in size, shaping of the foot and the spring, the examples from Kvarner were traditionally attributed to the Liburnian variant.<sup>146</sup> Although they are similar in their construction and form, they differ in the form of knobs and geometric decoration, an observation which was already stressed by D. Glogović.<sup>147</sup> Unfortunately, she did not elaborate and differentiate the proposed typology, but included the examples from Kvarner into a group named the "northern variant of the Liburnian fibula". Among these fibulae of the *Kvarner variant* the knob is markedly pulled out, it is thin and has a sharp edge. It is an observable rule regardless of the size of the knob. Above the knobs, in the direction of the bow, a metope follows decorated with garlands and the highest point in one or two metopes is decorated with hatched rhomboids or the motive of the fish bone. The foot is mostly semi-circular, but regularly hammered – sometimes even decorated (cat. 1, 30-31, 45-46, 55-56, 174, 220, fig. 22). Only the small fibula from Šula (cat. 220) features an additional strengthening of the spring and pin.<sup>148</sup> A special characteristic of the fibulae from Kvarner

<sup>146</sup> Batović 1983: 310; Glogović 1989: 17-18; Teržan 1995: 355-357, f.n. 67; Teržan 2007: Pl. XXXVIb. D. Glogović po njima obilježava čak čitav horizont vremenski usklađen s HaA2 stupnjem (Glogović 1989: 39, Sl. 9). S Kvarnera potječe ukupno 10 primjeraka navedenog tipa fibula.

<sup>147</sup> Glogović 1987: 80-81; Glogović 1989: 17-18.


<sup>148</sup> Fibula svojim dimenzijama, oblikovanjem nožice i opruge odskače od ostalih kvarnerskih primjeraka i približava se fibulama iz liburnskog prostora. Međutim, oštrobridna dugmeta, ukras girlandi na luku i kompozicija ukrasa u metopnim poljima jasno je određuje, doduše, kao inačicu kvarnerskih fibula.

<sup>149</sup> Iznimku predstavlja fibula japodske varijante iz groba 272 nekropole Škocjan-

<sup>146</sup> Batović 1983: 310; Glogović 1989: 17-18; Teržan 1995: 355-357, f.n. 67; Teržan 2007: Pl. XXXVIb. D. Glogović even used them to determine a whole horizon and to chronologically harmonize it with the phase HaA2 (Glogović 1989: 39, Sl. 9). From Kvarner come a total of 10 fibulae of the cited type.

<sup>147</sup> Glogović 1987: 80-81; Glogović 1989: 17-18.

<sup>148</sup> The fibula with its dimensions, form of the foot and spring, stands out from



**Slika 21.** Krk, sporadični nalazi (crteži i idealna rekonstrukcija prema Lo Schiavo 1970; Glogović 1989; Batović 2003).

**Figure 21.** Krk, sporadic finds (drawings and ideal reconstruction after Lo Schiavo 1970; Glogović 1989; Batović 2003).

iz Osora (sl. 41: 55-56), što kod ostalih varijanti fibula na čitavom jadranskom priobalju i zaleđu nije uočeno.

*Liburnska varijanta* fibula, naprotiv, ima manja i zdepastija, ponekad čak i ukrašena, dugmeta. Specifična pojava na liburnskom području su i dvostruko profilirana dugmeta koja na drugim varijantama nisu zabilježena. Nožice su im uže i niže raskovane, ponekad ukrašene iskucavanjem. Karakteristika njihova dekora svodi se na manje metopnih polja redovito ukrašenih paralelnim linijama, trokutastim ili cik-cak ornamentima te motivom riblje kosti i borovih grančica. Girlande na tim fibulama u potpunosti manjkaju.<sup>150</sup> Korpusu se pridodaje i posljednji nalaz fibule iz Nina, koji upravo odgovara onima s ukrašenim dugmetom, te stoga povećava brojnost fibula s dvostruko profiliranim dugmetima na luku.<sup>151</sup> Do sada je bila poznata samo manja fibula iz Raštana Donjih, smatrana

is their different ritual handling which, apart from the fragmented fibulae from Stolnić (fig. 19: 1), Novalja (fig. 23: 31) and Škocjan,<sup>149</sup> is reflected in the intentional deformation of the fibulae from Osor (fig. 41: 55-56) – a manipulation not known in all the other fibulae of this type on the Adriatic coast and its hinterland.

The *Liburnian variant* of the fibulae is on the contrary smaller and stocky, sometimes even decorated with round knobs. A specific form, on the Liburnian territory are also double profiled knobs – a feature not found in any other fibulae. Their feet are narrower and hammered in the lower part, sometimes decorated by embossing. Their characteristic decoration is composed of a smaller number of metopes decorated with parallel lines, triangles and zigzag ornaments and motives in the form of a fish bone and a pine twig, while the garlands are completely absent.<sup>150</sup> We could add to the group a

Brežec koja je također polomljena (Steffé De Piero 1977: T. XXIII: T. 272: 2) što se uglavnom može povezati uz kulturu dobro poznate prakse ritualiziranja predmeta općenito na škocjanskom prostoru.


<sup>150</sup> Za usporedbu vidjeti kod radova D. Glogović (1989: T. 13-16; 2003: T. 1: 7-8, T. 2-4). Zanimljivo je kako se ukras usporednih girlandi nalazi na lučnim velikim fibulama iz središnjeg liburnskog prostora (Glogović 2003, T. 8: 48-49; T. 9: 52-52C).

<sup>151</sup> Neobjavljeno, Muzej ninskih starina, Nin.

other examples of the Kvarner variant, and is approaching to the fibulae from the Liburnian area. However, sharp-edged knobs, decoration of garlands on the bow and composition ornaments in metopes clearly classified it as a variant of the Kvarner fibulae.

<sup>149</sup> An exception is the fibula of the Japodian variant, discovered in grave 272 from the necropolis Brežec in Škocjan which was also broken (Steffé De Piero 1977: T. XXIII: T. 272: 2). The fact could be linked to the well-known culture of ritual grave goods fragmentation practiced on the territory of Škocjan.

<sup>150</sup> For a comparison see the works of D. Glogović (1989: T. 13-16; 2003: T. 1: 7-8,



**Slika 22.** Karta rasprostranjenosti fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku liburnske (●), japodske (■) i kvarnerske (▲) varijante te italskih importa s dvostruko profiliranim dugmetom (★) (nadopunjeno prema Drechsler-Bižić 1976; Glogović 2003) (Lista 1).

**Figure 22.** Distribution map of the bow fibula with two knobs on the bow: liburnian (●), japodian (■) and kvarnerian (▲) variants, and with the italic import with double profiled knobs (★) (supplemented after Drechsler-Bižić 1976; Glogović 2003) (List 1).

importom iz srednje Italije,<sup>152</sup> premda bi se za obje fibule mogla pretpostavljati apulska provenijencija (sl. 22).

Još se više razlikuje tzv. *japodska varijanta* fibula obilježena osjetno manjim dimenzijama, neusklađenih odnosa konstrukcijskih elemenata.<sup>153</sup> Karakteristična im je hipertrofična i polukružno raskovana nožica koja je najčešće ukrašena geometrijskim iskanim motivima, zatim manja jedva naglašena bikonična, ali zaobljena dugmeta na luku. Luk im je pak ukrašen isključivo metopno urezanim linijama znatno manje iskorištenog prostora te se ono odnosi u pravilu na snopove paralelno urezanih linija ili trokutastih motiva (sl. 22).<sup>154</sup>

<sup>152</sup> Glogović 1989: 18; usp. za južnoitalske primjerke gdje ih je zabilježen povećani broj, s dobrim paralelama u apulskom Monte Saraceno (Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 7: 64-65; T. 9; T. 10: 70C-72).

<sup>153</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1976: T. I-II; Glogović 1989: T. 16: 1-2.

<sup>154</sup> Tipološka klasifikacija i grupiranje pojedinih fibula koju je ponudila S. Pabst problematična je zbog nedosljednog manipuliranja atributima fibula. Ona se, naime, oslanja najvećim dijelom na oblikovanje opruge, i to njezine veličine, te potom distinkcija glede ukrašavanja. Tako je, primjerice, fibula iz Osora, zajedno s fibulom iz Ljupča pridružena tzv. japodskoj varijanti, od kojih obje odudaraju masivnošću i ukrašavanjem luka, oblikom i ukrašavanjem dugmeta itd. Svakako, u većini su sve fibule s prostora Kvarnera i Dalmacije, te one iz škocjanskih nalazišta, uvrštene, bez razlikovnosti, u tzv. *sjevroistončnojadransku seriju* (Pabst 2009: 12, 18, Abb. 5; Pabst 2012: 47-48, 307-308, K. 38). Ta je pak združena s primjercima iz Makedonije u tip *Šula-Prilep*, iako se one međusobno znatno razlikuju, bez obzira na veličinu opruge ili veličinu nožice, koje upravo i najčešće znaju biti oštećene. Bitno je da one cjelokupnom morfologijom fibule, načinom izvedbe, oblikovanjem

recent discovery of a fibula from Nin which exhibits the characteristics of fibulae with decorated knobs, increasing thus the number of this specific type.<sup>151</sup> So far only a smaller fibula from Raštani Donji has been known. It was considered to be an import for the territory of central Italy<sup>152</sup> – although Apulia could be a more likely place of origin of both fibulae (fig. 22).

Even more distinctive is the Japodian variant of fibulae – it is significantly smaller and features disproportional relations of construction elements.<sup>153</sup> Its characteristic is a hypertrophic and halve circled forged foot which is in most cases decorated with geometric hammered motives, with a single hardly accentuated byconical knob on the bow. Their bow is decorated exclusively with incised metopes using less space – they are, as a rule, just sheaves of parallel lines or triangular motives (fig. 22).<sup>154</sup> Despite the fact that every fibula is uniquely manufactured and has no "copy", most similarities in the division and decoration of metopes from the find from Stolnić can be observed in the great fibula from Grižane and the smaller example from Šula (cat. 174, 220). As suggested by the spatial distribution of these regional peculiarities, people in the past apparently paid particular attention to wearing those significant parts of costume and thus they did not mix them (fig. 22).<sup>155</sup> If this hypothesis proves correct, it will undoubtedly testify about the activity of several production centres. Precious information are provided by the sites around

T. 2-4). It is also interesting that the decoration of parallel garlands could be observed on large bow fibulae from the central Liburnian territory (Glogović 2003, T. 8: 48-49; T. 9: 52-52C).

<sup>151</sup> Unpublished. Museum of Nin antiquities, Nin.

<sup>152</sup> Glogović 1989: 18. For good comparisons see the larger number of southern Italian examples in the Apulian Monte Saraceno (Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 7: 64-65; T. 9; T. 10: 70C-72).

<sup>153</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1976: T. I-II; Glogović 1989: T. 16: 1-2.

<sup>154</sup> The typological classification and grouping of individual fibulae, as suggested by S. Pabst, is problematic due to the inconsistent manipulation with the attributes of fibulae. She focuses mainly on the form of the spring, i.e. its size and the decoration of the fibula. In this way she added the fibula from Osor, together with the fibula from Ljubač in to the so called Japodian group, although they both differ from the later due to the massiveness of the bow and its decoration, the form and decoration of the knobs and other details. She joined the majority of fibulae from the territory of Kvarner and Dalmatia, as well as the examples from the sites around Škocjan, without further divisions, in to a so called *northern Adriatic series* (Pabst 2009: 12, 18, Abb. 5; 2012: 47-48, 307-308, K. 38). The later was joined with examples from Macedonia in to the type *Šula-Prilep* although they differ significantly regardless the size of the spring or foot which are damaged in most cases. It is important that they with their total morphology, mode of production, forming of the knob, mode of decoration and most of all dating of closed context from which the come additionally argument their specificity and the impossibility of lumping them all together. The same goes for their dating which is not elaborated but taken over from different authors accepting consequently old (and too low) dating – at least in the case of fibulae from the eastern Adriatic. This problem was already discussed by D. Glogović (1989: 17-18). In contrast to such an inventive reflection of the discussed fibulae stands the passive and anachronous position of V. Barbarić which still reproduces the erroneous information about their production and distribution especially on the territory of Istria, where they are not present at all, Picenum, where there are present typologically completely different varieties of these fibulae, and their chronology considering that their use lasted for more than 3 centuries (Barbarić 2009: 314-316)!

<sup>155</sup> The large fibula from Šula (cat. 45) is not separated from this corpus since it demonstrates all the characteristics significant for the Kvarner group, although not having the decoration of garlands above the knobs. To the fibula from Grižane should be added another identical example not documented in the Collection of the AMZ but it was published by Š. Ljubić, as well as the fragment of a pin with a circular (onion-shaped) head (Ljubić 1876: 28, 36). See *Grižane* in the catalogue.

Premda je svaka fibula doista unikatne izradbe i za sada bez "dvojnice", najviše srodnosti stolničjoj fibuli, prema rasporedu i ukrasu metopnih polja, moguće je vidjeti kod velike fibule iz Grižana i kod manje fibule iz Šule (kat. 174, 220). Kako sugerira karta njihove regionalne prepoznatljivosti, čini se da se strogo vodilo računa o nošenju tog znakovitog dijela nošnje i da stoga ne dolazi do njihova ispreplitanja (sl. 22).<sup>155</sup> Pokaže li se ta spoznaja ispravnom, nepobitno će svjedočiti i o djelovanju barem nekoliko različitih proizvođačkih središta. Dragocjene podatke pružaju nam, naravno, škocjanska nalazišta - nekropola Brežec, grobovi 114,<sup>156</sup> 116 i 272,<sup>157</sup> i ostava iz Mušje jame,<sup>158</sup> gdje se nalaze primjerci i kvarnerske i japodske varijante, što naposljetku u odnosu na inventare grobova i same ostave te na njihovu interpretaciju ne iznenađuje.<sup>159</sup> Zbog toga je moguće i te primjerke preko sjevernojadranskog prostora povezati u širi mediteranski prostor kulturne *koiné*, a sukladno njihovim grobnim cjelinama, kao i prijedlogu P. Turka u klasifikaciji najstarijeg horizonta pokopavanja na toj nekropoli (Brežec I),<sup>160</sup> datirati nešto više, sada već i od kraja 12. i u 11. stoljeće (sl. 42).<sup>161</sup> Napokon, u procesu kulturnih kontakata i međusobnih posredovanja možda se može prosuđivati i o nedovršenom

dugmeta i načinom ukrašavanja te, prije svega, drugačije datacije njihovih pojedinih zatvorenih konteksta, dodatno argumentiraju njihovu specifičnost i tako nemogućnost stavljanja pod zajednički nazivnik. Isto se svakako odnosi i na primjenu njihovih datacija, koja nije razrađena već prihvaćena od različitih autora onako kako su one nekada bile (prenisko) definirane, barem što se istočnojadranskih fibula tiče. O tome je također već raspravljala D. Glogović (1989: 17-18). U suprotnosti s tako inventivnim promišljanjem o predmetnom tipu fibula, stoji pak pasivna i anakrona pozicija V. Barbarića, koji i dalje prenosi netočne podatke o njihovoj proizvodnji, rasprostranjenosti, poglavito na područje Istre, gdje uopće nisu nazočne, i Picena, gdje su tipološki zastupljene posve druge varijante istoimenih fibula, i kronologiji, smatrajući da njezina uporaba traje više od 3 stoljeća (Barbarić 2009: 314-316)!

- <sup>155</sup> Velika fibula iz Šule (kat. 45) nije izdvojena iz toga korpusa, jer pokazuje sve temeljne karakteristike značajne za kvarnersku varijantu, iako nema poseban ukras girlandi iznad dugmeta. Fibuli iz Grižana treba, dakle, dodati još jedan istovjetni primjerak koji nije dokumentiran u Zbirci AMZ-a, ali se navodi u objavama Š. Ljubića, upravo kao i ulomak igle s okruglom (lukovičastom) glavicom i polomljenom iglom (Ljubić 1876: 28, 36). Vidjeti katalog *Grižane*.
- <sup>156</sup> Potrebno je ponovno navesti kako se u grobu, prema opisu C. Marchesettia, nalazio i ulomak igle i čak dvije narukvice (Vitri 1977: 81), što potvrđuje nošnju poznatu upravo s područja Kvarnera.
- <sup>157</sup> Vitri 1977: 81-82; Steffé De Piero 1977: 110; Vitri 1979: 81-82, T. 1: 2.
- <sup>158</sup> Guštin 1975: Sl. 1; Vitri 1983: T. 42: 8; Borgna, Montagnari Kokelj 1999: 141, Fig. 3.
- <sup>159</sup> Turk 1994: 154-155, 163-164.
- <sup>160</sup> Turk 1994: 152, 154.
- <sup>161</sup> Dodatnu potvrdu istome argumentirala je B. Teržan smještajem malog željeznog noža iz groba 272 nekropole Brežec (Steffé de Piero 1977: T. XXIII: T. 272) u širi kontekst egejskog i istočnomediteranskog prostora 12. i 11. stoljeća (Teržan 1995: 360, Abb. 28: 3), gdje noževi zajedno s vrhovima koplja predstavljaju gotovo standardni dio opreme muških grobova (Eder, Jung 2005: 490), iako nisu rijetkost i u ženskim grobovima. Stanje nadopunjuje s nešto većim ulomkom noža iz groba 417 tolminske nekropole, datirajući ga, ovaj put, na prijelaz tisućljeća i povezujući ga uz "glasnike" uvođenja nove metalurgije (Gabrovec 1987a: T. XII: 2; Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 82: 2; Teržan 2002: 87). O smještaju pojedinih nalaza iz Mušje jame u širi mediteranski prostor usp. Borgna 1999. O željeznim noževima usp. Blečić Kavur 2012a: 102-103; Trampuž Orel 2012: 21-23. S. Pabst podržava kronološki stariju poziciju asimetričnih fibula iz Grčke, u odnosu na one sjevernojadranskog prostora. Isto tako, npr. jednu od sicilijanskih fibula iz Pantalice klasificira, i posredno datira, s njezinim tipom Šula-Prilep (Pabst 2012: 406, K. 38). Međutim, raširenost takvih fibula na prostoru Sicilije u vrijeme horizonta Pantalica-Nord dokazuje da su kronološki dobro usklađene i s njihovom pojavom na području Egeje (Jung 2006: 193-194, f.n. 1421). U tom smislu grobovi iz nekropole Brežec ukazuju na eventualno nošnju fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku i do horizonta HaA2/B1, ili će u tim grobovima obilježavati stariju vrijednost, što nije još posve razjašnjeno. Bitno je da su se u oba brežečka groba (114 i 272) nalazili ulomci željeznih noževa kao elementi određenog egzotizama, a svojstvenog simboličkog značenja.

Škocjan – on the Brežec necropolis in graves 114,<sup>156</sup> 116 and 272,<sup>157</sup> and in the hoard of Mušja jama<sup>158</sup> where examples of the Japodian and Kvarnerian variant can be observed, which is not surprising with regard to the grave inventories, the character of the hoard and their interpretation.<sup>159</sup> Because of that these examples can be included into the broader Mediterranean *koiné*, which according to other grave goods and the suggestion by P. Turk can determine the initial phase of burials on the necropolis (Brežec I)<sup>160</sup> dated back to the period between the middle 12<sup>th</sup> and the 11<sup>th</sup> century (fig. 42).<sup>161</sup> Finally, in the process of cultural contacts and mutual connections the unfinished or intentionally deformed fragment of a massive bronze wire from the depot in Debeli vrh above Predgrad can be assessed.<sup>162</sup> According to basic characteristics it could be considered as being a part of a Japodian variant of a fibula with two knobs on the bow, but due to the mode of deformation, its bending and the lack of the knob (?), it irrepressibly reminds of the example of such variants of fibulae from the Kvarner area of Osor (cat. 55, 56), which is actually unfinished and/or ritually destroyed. In respect to the composition of such a rich hoard of a mixed type dated back to the II<sup>nd</sup> horizon of hoards,<sup>163</sup> this idea does not seem impossible.<sup>164</sup>

Even if the example of the "reconstructed grave" from Baška indeed represents just a large bow fibula, lacking the knob on the bow, it fits as such into our knowledge of the then wear of these fibulae on the Kvarner territory. Besides, several fibulae of this type are known from Kvarner, but unfortunately they lack the contexts. Somehow closer to this assumption could be the fibulae with a decorated bow

<sup>156</sup> It is important to note that according to the description of C. Marchesetti there was in the grave also a fragment of a pin and even two bracelets (Vitri 1977: 81), confirming the combination of attire known from the territory of Kvarner.

<sup>157</sup> Vitri 1977: 81-82; Steffé De Piero 1977: 110; Vitri 1979: 81-82, T. 1: 2.

<sup>158</sup> Guštin 1975: Sl. 1; Vitri 1983: T. 42: 8; Borgna, Montagnari Kokelj 1999: 141, Fig. 3.

<sup>159</sup> Turk 1994: 154-155, 163-164.

<sup>160</sup> Turk 1994: 152, 154.

<sup>161</sup> An additional confirmation was provided by B. Teržan who placed the small iron knife from grave 272 from the necropolis in Brežec (Steffé de Piero 1977: T. XXIII: T. 272) into a broader context of the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean area into the 12<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> century (Teržan 1995: 360, Abb. 28: 3) where knives together with spear points represent a standard form of equipment of male graves (Eder, Jung 2005: 490), although they were also present in female graves. The state is supplemented also by a larger fragment of a knife from grave 417 from the necropolis in Tolmin dated this time into the turn of the millennium and linked to the "heralds" of the introduction of a new metallurgy (Gabrovec 1987a: T. XII: 2; Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 82: 2; Teržan 2002: 87). About the inclusion of individual finds from Mušja jama into a broader Mediterranean context see E. Borgna (1999). For iron knives see also Blečić Kavur 2012a: 102-103; Trampuž Orel 2012: 21-23. S. Pabst supports the chronologically older position of asymmetric fibulae from Greece in relation to the examples from the northern Adriatic territory. In the same way she classifies and dates indirectly one of the Sicilian fibulae from Pantalica into the type Šula-Prilep (Pabst 2012: 406, K. 38). However, the distribution of such fibula on the territory of Sicily in the horizon Pantalica-Nord is chronologically well synchronized with their use in the Aegean territory (Jung 2006: 193-194, f.n. 1421). In this sense, the graves from the necropolis in Brežec demonstrate the possible use of fibulae with two knobs on the bow until the HaA2/B1 horizon – or they represent, although it is not yet cleared, an older valued piece in these graves. It is important that in both graves from Brežec (114 and 272) fragments of iron knives were discovered representing elements of specific exoticism with a characteristic symbolic meaning.


<sup>162</sup> Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 167, T. 66: 73.

<sup>163</sup> Turk 1996: 108.

<sup>164</sup> In favor of such a consideration a fragment of a ribbed bronze plate could be used which reminds of a variant of a cuff-shaped bracelet which has an incised decoration on the ribs. These incisions are a characteristic of the bracelets from Šula, Garica and Osor (cat. 60, 164, 221-222) (Blečić Kavur 2012a: 103). See the discussion further in the text.








**Slika 23.** Sporadični nalazi nakita i nošnje iz uništene nekropole u Vidasima (Vidasa Napolju) kod Novalje (prema Glogović 1991).

**Figure 23.** Individual finds of jewelry and attire from a destroyed part of the Vidasi necropolis (Vidasa Napolju) near Novalja (after Glogović 1991).



**Slika 24.** Fibula i torques iz groba u Senju (kat. 26-27), te fibula iz nepoznatog nalazišta (Košljun) (kat. 29) (prema Ljubović 2000; Glogović 2003).

**Figure 24.** Fibula and torques from the grave in Senj (cat. 26-27) and fibula from the unknown site (Košljun) (cat. 29) (after Ljubović 2000; Glogović 2003).

ili namjerno deformiranom ulomku masivne brončane žice iz ostave Debeli vrh pri Pregradu.<sup>162</sup> Prema osnovnim indikacijama približiti se može japodskoj varijanti fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, ali načinom deformacije, presavijanjem i bez dugmeta (?), neodoljivo podsjeća na primjerke toga tipa fibula iz kvarnerskog Osora (kat. 55, 56) koji je zapravo nedovršen i/ili namjerno ritualiziran. S obzirom na sastav tako bogate ostave mješovitog tipa, datirane u II. horizont ostava,<sup>163</sup> ta se pomisao ne čini nemogućom.<sup>164</sup>

Ako primjerak iz tzv. "rekonstruiranog groba" iz Baške uistinu predstavlja jednostavnu veliku lučnu fibulu bez dugmeta na luku i kao takav se dobro uklapa u naše poznavanje tadašnje nošnje fibula s Kvarnera. Poznato je nekoliko takvih primjeraka, doduše, bez bliže znanih okolnosti nalaženja. Nekako bi najbliže toj pretpostavci mogle biti fibule s ukrašenim lukom kakve potječu iz Novalje, Vidasa Napolju (kat. 33, sl. 23)<sup>165</sup> i iz Zbirke franjevačkog samostana na otoku Košljunu.<sup>166</sup> Fibula iz Košljuna (kat. 29, sl. 24) ponavlja način izradbe opruge, luka i nožice kakav je poznat kod fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, pa joj je opruga četvrtasto profilirana, luk kružno, dok je nožica trapezoidno raskucana i povijena. Na luku je očuvan ukras urezanih paralelnih linija, a na nožici paralelno iskucanih dva reda točkica koje prate liniju nožice. Za razliku od nje, fibula iz Novalje nema oprugu i sva je izrađena od jedne, različito profilirane žice. Na luku su tragovi ukrasa, urezanih borovih grančica. Pridružiti im se može i treća lučna jednopetljasta fibula koja, zajedno s tordiranim torkvesom potječe iz Senja (kat. 26-27, sl. 24).<sup>167</sup> Ona ima pseudotordirani luk, na sredini četvrtasto profiliran, i trapezasto raskucanu te povijenu nožicu s iskucanim ornamentom dva reda paralelnih točkica, gotovo identičnog kao kod fibule iz Košljuna.

known from Novalja, Vidasa Napolju (cat. 33, fig. 23)<sup>165</sup> and from the Franciscan monastery on the island of Košljun.<sup>166</sup> The latter (cat. 29, fig. 24) demonstrated the same mode of fabrication of the spring, the bow and the foot as we know them on bowed fibulae with two knobs on the bow – the loop is of a square cross-section, the bow of a circular and the foot is trapezoidal hammered and folded. The bow is decorated with incised parallel lines and the fibula from Novalja, on the contrary, was made from a single wire of different cross-sections without a spring. The bow was decorated with an incised motive of a pine twig. A third bow fibula with a single loop can be added. It derives together with a twisted torques from Senj (cat. 26-27, fig. 24).<sup>167</sup> It presents a pseudo-twisted bow with a square cross-section in the middle and a trapezoidal hammered and folded foot with a decoration on the foot of two rows of hammered points running along the edge of it – a decoration identical as the one on the fibula from Košljun.

It can be observed that all three fibulae have a lower and narrower foot than the fibulae deriving from the central or peripheral Liburnian territory, and, of course, they differ from the fibulae coming from the Japodian territory. All other bowed single looped fibulae are dated back to the beginning of the Iron Age of Liburnia with a possibility to last until the developed III<sup>rd</sup> phase, as in grave 30 in Nin, they were discovered together with a fibula of the protocertosa type.<sup>168</sup> Nevertheless, the fibula from Senj was compared to similar examples of fibulae from Italy, displaying the characteristics of the Protovillanova period of central Italy<sup>169</sup> or the period BF2/3, and can thus be dated into the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> and into the 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>170</sup> Such a dating would perfectly suit also all other large bowed fibulae from the sites of Kvarner and would point to the fact that they were

<sup>162</sup> Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 167, T. 66: 73.

<sup>163</sup> Turk 1996: 108.

<sup>164</sup> U korist takvog promišljanja možda može poslužiti i ulomak narebrene brončane ploče koji toliko asocira na varijantu manšetaste narebrene narukvice koja po rebrima ima ukras urezanih crtica. To je oznaka istih narukvica iz Šule, Garice i Osora (kat. 60, 164, 221-222) (Blečić Kavur 2012a: 103). O tome vidjeti dalje u tekstu.

<sup>165</sup> Glogović 1991: T. 3: 3.

<sup>166</sup> Glogović 2003: 14, T. 7: 43.

<sup>167</sup> Glogović 2003: 14, T. 8: 50.

<sup>165</sup> Glogović 1991: T. 3: 3.

<sup>166</sup> Glogović 2003: 14, T. 7: 43.

<sup>167</sup> Glogović 2003: 14, T. 8: 50.

<sup>168</sup> Glogović 2003: 15. The grave inventory was conservatively ascribed to a lower relative scheme. Although considering the typological characteristics of other finds in the grave, as well as the dating of fibulae of the protocertosa type, it could be included into the 7<sup>th</sup> century. About this and other problems regarding the graves from Nin see Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014: Sl. 7.

<sup>169</sup> Glogović 2003: 15.

<sup>170</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1999: T. 30: 21; Pacciarelli 2005.



Primjetno je da sve tri fibule imaju užu i nižu nožicu od fibula koje potječu iz matičnog ili okolnog liburnskog prostora, a nisu sukladne niti s lučnim fibulama iz japodskog područja. No kao i sve ostale lučne jednopetljaste fibule datirane su na sam početak želznog doba Liburnije s mogućnošću trajanja do razvijene III. faze, jer se u Ninu, u grobu 30, pojavljuju s tipom fibule protocertosa.<sup>168</sup> Ipak, fibula iz Senja uspoređena je s vrlo sličnim italjskim primjercima koji su izdignuti u obilježje protovillanovskog razdoblja srednje Italije,<sup>169</sup> odnosno stupnja BF2/3 pa se sukladno tomu i mogu datirati već na kraj 11., odnosno u 10. stoljeće.<sup>170</sup> Takva bi datacija uostalom pogodovala i ostalim velikim lučnim fibulama iz kvarnerskih nalazišta i ukazala na to da su barem neko vrijeme bile istovremeno u nošnji s lučnim fibulama sa dva dugmeta na luku.

Već je konvencionalno tome tipu fibula pribrojena i veća lučna fibula iz Garice, koja je zanimljiva svojim bogatim ukrasom na luku i široko raskovanoj, iskucavanjem reljefno ukrašenoj nožici (kat. 160).<sup>171</sup> Na području istočnojadranskih kultura i zaleđa za sada joj nema srodnijih paralela. No možemo ih naći kod nasuprotnih italjskih nalazišta posebice na području Picena i tirenske obale, npr. u ostavi Limone.<sup>172</sup> Srodnosti se dalje mogu vidjeti i kod velike fibule iz Piemonta,<sup>173</sup> čiji je luk dodatno ukrašen interpolacijom osam lijevanih privjesaka u obliku ptice/patke, ali čija je šire polukružno raskucana nožica s obje strane ukrašena iskucavanjem motiva, upravo kao i garički primjerak. Zacijelo vrlo srodna je i fibula iz picenskog Monte Prima,<sup>174</sup> također dodatno ukrašenog luka interpolacijom žičanog dodatka kao nosača za četiri ptice/patke, no ovog puta s unutrašnje strane luka. Fibule uglavnom potječu iz ostava i odabrane su za tipičnog predstavnika ostava BF2/3 faze 11./10. stoljeća,<sup>175</sup> pa, izgledno je, fibulu iz Garice valja shvatiti kao istovremeni izravni import na nasuprotnu obalu područja Kvarnera.

Međutim, odlika europskog kasnog brončanog doba prije svega su prestižem obilježeni predmeti. Kvantitativno su zastupljeni i na prostoru sjevernoga Jadrana, posebno na njegovom vitalnom dijelu – Kvarneru. U najviši i ekskluzivni rang luksuznog nakita toga vremena ubrajaju se jantarne perle tipa Tiryns i Allumiere,<sup>176</sup> tradicionalno smatranim pokazateljima kontakata izrazitih udaljenosti (sl. 25). U do sada poznatim zatvorenim cjelinama izravno su, dakle, povezana uz opisane fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku. Znatan broj takvih perli potječe iz Baške iz tzv. "rekonstruiranog groba", par primjeraka iz Krka te jedna perla iz Novalje koje, nažalost, imaju oskudne podatke o kontekstu nalaženja (kat. 10-11, 22-24, 30, sl. 20-21, 23).<sup>177</sup> Prema tipologiji Nuccie Negroni Catacchio

simultaneously used, at least for a period of time, with bowed fibulae with two knobs on the bow.

Although exact parallels are not available, the fibula from "Garica" was added to this type of fibulae. It is an interesting find with a rich decoration on the bow and a widely hammered, in relief embossed foot (cat. 160).<sup>171</sup> On the territory of the eastern Adriatic cultures and of their hinterlands no comparisons are currently available. However, we can observe them on the opposite coast, especially on the territory of Picenum and the Tyrenian coast – for example in the hoard from Limone.<sup>172</sup> Similarities can be further observed in the large fibula from Piemonte,<sup>173</sup> which had its bow further decorated by adding eight cast pendants in the form of a bird/duck. Its widely hammered and semi-circular formed foot was decorated on both sides by embossed motives – in the same fashion as shown in the example from Garica. We could consider as being very similar also the fibula from the picenian Monte Primo,<sup>174</sup> which had the bow also decorated with a wire functioning as the attachment for four birds/ducks which were added on the inner side of the bow. These fibulae come from hoards and were selected for being typical representatives of the phase of depots BF2/3 from the 11<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>175</sup> Consequently we should consider the fibula from Garica as a contemporary direct import from the opposite side of the Adriatic coast into the Kvarner area.

However, the European Late Bronze Age is primarily characterised by items denoting prestige. It is thus no wonder that large quantities of such prestigious artefacts are found also on the territory of the northern Adriatic, and particularly in its vital part – the Kvarner Gulf. Amber beads of the Tiryns and Allumiere type<sup>176</sup> as the most luxurious items of jewelry were traditionally considered to be indicators of long distance contacts (fig. 25) and are directly related to the described fibulae with two knobs on the bow. A considerable number of these beads comes from the so called "reconstructed grave" from Baška, a pair of them from Krk(?) and a single bead, unfortunately with poor information about its discovery, from Novalja (cat. 10-11, 22-24, 30, fig. 20-21, 23).<sup>177</sup>

According to the typology of Nuccia Negroni Catacchio and her associates,<sup>178</sup> the finds of amber beads of the Tiryns type from Baška and Krk could be included into the variant 4C of cylindrical beads with a central rib to which the finds from Vrsi (fig. 26) and Privlaka should also be added.<sup>179</sup> On the contrary, only the find from Novalja could be included into variant 4A and the find from Privlaka into variant 4B.<sup>180</sup> Beads of Allumiere type from Baška and Krk, according to the same typology, could be included into variant 5A/B of cylindrical beads with transverse grooves to which also a bead from Privlaka

<sup>168</sup> Glogović 2003: 15. Navedena grobna cjelina konzervativno je pripisivana nižoj relativnoj shemi, iako se, s obzirom na tipološka obilježja ostalih nalaza u grobu, te dataciju fibula tipa protocertosa s kuglicom na kraju noge, može tretirati već u 7. stoljeću. O toj i drugoj problematici glede ninskih grobova usp. Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014: Sl. 7.

<sup>169</sup> Glogović 2003: 15.

<sup>170</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1999: T. 30: 21; Pacciarelli 2001: 83.

<sup>171</sup> Glogović 1989: T. 18: 6; Glogović 2003: T. 7: 42. Fibula je bila pogrešno objavljena pod nalazištem *Krbavica* (Drechsler-Bižić 1976: T. III: 1).

<sup>172</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 52: B1; T. 57: A2-3; Bianco Peroni 1979: T. 97: 20; Peroni et al. 1980: 34-35, T. XV: 41B.

<sup>173</sup> Gambari, Venturino Gambari 1997: 341, Fig. 1; Analogan primjerak potječe iz Picenuma, bez poznatog mjesta nalazišta, određen kao tip Sundwall J II aa.b (Mangani 2003: 295, 299, T. VIIIb).

<sup>174</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 57: A1.

<sup>175</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1999: 62, T. 30: 21; T. 32.

<sup>176</sup> Harding, Hughes-Brock 1974: 145-172; Harding 1984: 82-87; Hughes-Brock 1993: 219-229; Eder, Jung 2005: 487; usp. Pare 2008: 90, Fig. 5.13; Bellintani 2010: 143-144.

<sup>177</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: T. XXIII: 9-11; 13-16, T. XLII: 19, 20; Glogović 1989: 24-25, 35-

<sup>171</sup> Glogović 1989: T. 18: 6; Glogović 2003: T. 7: 42. The fibula was mistakenly published under the site of *Krbavica* (Drechsler-Bižić 1976: T. III: 1).

<sup>172</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 52: B1; T. 57: A2-3; Bianco Peroni 1979: T. 97: 20; Peroni et al. 1980: 34-35, T. XV: 41B.

<sup>173</sup> Gambari, Venturino Gambari 1997: 341, Fig. 1. An analogous example, determined as the type Sundwall J II aa.b comes from Picenum which lacks detailed information about the place of discovery (Mangani 2003: 295, 299, T. VIIIb).

<sup>174</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 57: A1.

<sup>175</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1999: 62, T. 30: 21; T. 32.


<sup>176</sup> Harding, Hughes-Brock 1974: 145-172; Harding 1984: 82-87; Hughes-Brock 1993: 219-229; Eder, Jung 2005: 487; comp. Pare 2008: 90, Fig. 5.13; Bellintani 2010: 143-144.

<sup>177</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: T. XXIII: 9-11; 13-16, T. XLII: 19, 20; Glogović 1989: 24-25, 35-36, T. 43: 1-2; Glogović 1991: T. 1: 2; Batović 2003: Sl. 4: 2-6, Sl. 6: 5.

<sup>178</sup> Negroni Catacchio et al. 2006: 1444-1453, Fig. 2.

<sup>179</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIV: 19.

<sup>180</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIV: 20.



**Slika 25.** Rasprostranjenost jantarnih perli tipa Tiryns (●) i tipa Allumiere (▲) (nadopunjeno prema Cultraro 2006; Negroni Cattachio et al. 2006; Blečić Kavur 2012a) (Lista 2).

**Figure 25.** Distribution map of amber beads of Tiryns (●) and Allumiere (▲) types (supplemented after Cultraro 2006; Negroni Cattachio et al. 2006; Blečić Kavur 2012a) (List 2).

i suradnika<sup>178</sup> nalazi jantara tipa Tiryns iz Baške i Krka mogu se pribrojiti tzv. varijanti 4C cilindričnih perli sa središnjim rebrom, kojoj ujedno pripadaju i perle iz Vrsi (sl. 26) i Privlake.<sup>179</sup> Naprotiv, varijanti 4A približava se jedino perla iz Novalje, odnosno varijanti 4B perla iz Privlake.<sup>180</sup> Perle tipa Allumiere i iz Baške i iz Krka prema istoj tipologiji pribrojiti se pak mogu varijanti 5A/B cilindričnih perli s poprečnim žljebovima, kojima će također tipološki odgovarati i perla iz Privlake.<sup>181</sup> Posebnu grupu izgledno je, kako je kartirao i A. Palavestra,<sup>182</sup> činit će cilindrične veće perle iz Baške koje imaju više poprečnih žljebova raspoređenih u dvije skupine (sl. 16), ali i cilindrične perle sa dva rebra iz Baške zajedno s jedinom perlom iz pećine Golubnjača.<sup>183</sup> Po svojoj se izradbi mogu približiti grupi perli tipa Allumiere, ali mjesne varijante.<sup>184</sup>

Budući da su opisane perle jantara omiljena i dobro obrađivana tema u stručnoj literaturi, zna se kako obilježavaju inventare iznimno bogatih grobova iz nalazišta Italije, Grčke i Levanta (sl. 25), a to će potvrditi i nalazi s prostora gornjojadranskog bazena,

corresponds.<sup>181</sup> A distinct group of larger cylindrical beads with several transverse grooves was recognized and mapped by Aleksandar Palavestra.<sup>182</sup> They clustered into two groups (fig. 16) – the cylindrical beads with two ribs from Baška, and a single find from the cave of Golubnjača were included.<sup>183</sup> According to its manufacture they could be perceived as local variants of the Allumiere type.<sup>184</sup>

Due to the fact that these amber beads are a popular topic thoroughly dealt with in scientific literature, it is well known that they form a part of inventories of exceptionally rich graves from sites in Italy, Greece and Levant (fig. 25). Finds from the upper Adriatic basin, as for example the beads from Frattesina, Narde grave 75 (fig. 28),<sup>185</sup> grave XXXI from Bismantova (fig. 27),<sup>186</sup> Vrsi (fig. 26), Privlaka<sup>187</sup> and beads from Baška, e.i. from island Krk, confirm this statement (fig. 20-21).<sup>188</sup> On the territory of the Balkan peninsula and the eastern

36, T. 43: 1-2; Glogović 1991: T. 1: 2; Batović 2003: Sl. 4: 2-6, Sl. 6: 5.

<sup>178</sup> Negroni Cattachio et al. 2006: 1444-1453, Fig. 2.

<sup>179</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIV: 19.

<sup>180</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIV: 20.

<sup>181</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIV: 21.

<sup>182</sup> Palavestra 1993: 183; tip 2 i 3.

<sup>183</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1970: T. V: 1; Batović 1980: T. X: 9.

<sup>184</sup> Jantarna zrna koja su zabilježena na lokalitetima Trcela, Vranjic (Batović 1983: T. XLVIII: 5-12) i Križevci pripadaju bikoničnim zrnima koja se razlikuju tipovima 12 i 13 prema tipologiji A. Palavestre (1993: 191-192) i ne mogu se ubrajati u cilindrična zrna tipa Tiryns ili Allumiere, iako se i u novijoj literaturi još nalaze tako ili slično kartirana (npr. Cultraro 2006: Fig. 1; Negroni Cattachio et al. 2006: Fig. 7; Teržan 2007: Pl. XXXVIa).

<sup>181</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIV: 21.

<sup>182</sup> Palavestra 1993: 183; type 2 and 3.

<sup>183</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1970: T. V: 1; Batović 1980: T. X: 9.


<sup>184</sup> Amber beads discovered on the sites of Trcela, Vranjic (Batović 1983: T. XLVIII: 5-12) and Križevci belong to the group of byconical beads which differ from types 12 and 13 according to the typology of A. Palavestra (1993: 191-192). They cannot be included into the cylindrical beads of the Tiryns and Allumiere type although in the recent literature they are still mapped as such (for example Cultraro 2006: Fig. 1; Negroni Cattachio et al. 2006: Fig. 7; Teržan 2007: Pl. XXXVIa).

<sup>185</sup> Bellintani 2010, 143; Salzani, Colonna 2010: 210-212, T. VII: 27; T. 13.

<sup>186</sup> Catarsi, Dall'Aglio 1978: T. 31: 7, 8; Bietti Sestieri 1997: 765, Fig. 453: 29-30.

<sup>187</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIV: 15-21. When publishing the grave from Vrsi and Privlaka their inventories were mistakenly joined into the grave from Privlaka near Nin (Blečić Kavur 2012b: Sl. 6).

<sup>188</sup> In the literature, the finds from Krk were mapped in several modes – without the typological distinction (Teržan 1984a: 111, Fig. 1; Palavestra 1992: 382, M. 1, 2; Forenbaher 1995: 275-276: Fig. 5) or typologically dividing the Tiryns and



**Slika 26.** Repertoar nošnje i nakita iz groba iz Vrsi (prema Batović 1983).

**Figure 26.** The repertoire of attire and jewelry from the grave from Vrsi (after Batović 1983).

kao što su upravo perle iz Frattesine, Narde grob 75 (sl. 28),<sup>185</sup> pa dalje iz Bismantove, grob XXXI (sl. 27),<sup>186</sup> Vrsi (sl. 26) i Privlake<sup>187</sup> te napokon perle iz same Baške, tj. s otoka Krka (sl. 20-21).<sup>188</sup> Na prostoru Balkana i istočne obale Jadrana takve se perle javljaju kao predmet trgovačkih veza,<sup>189</sup> što nije slučaj i u Italiji, pr. u Frattesini ili na Sardiniji,<sup>190</sup> zatim unutar optoka tzv. *koiné metallurgica*,<sup>191</sup> ili

Adriatic coast such beads appear as results of trading connections,<sup>189</sup> as results of the processing inside the so called *koiné metallurgica*,<sup>190</sup> or even *koiné dell' ambra* as recently assumed,<sup>191</sup> which is not the case in Italy, for example in Frattesina or in Sardinia.<sup>192</sup> Thus the assumption that they were produced somewhere on the territory of the plain of Po,<sup>193</sup> is currently completely accepted and confirmed by every new research in Frattesina<sup>194</sup> – a decisive fact for the presence

<sup>185</sup> Bellintani 2010: 143; Salzani, Colonna 2010: 210-212, T. VII: 27; T. 13.

<sup>186</sup> Catarsi, Dall'Aglio 1978: T. 31: 7, 8; Bietti Sestieri 1997: 765, Fig. 453: 29-30.

<sup>187</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIV: 1-14; T. XLIV: 15-21. Prilikom objave grobova iz Vrsi i Privlake pogreškom su spojene njihove cjeline u grob iz Privlake kod Nina (Blečić Kavur 2012b: Sl. 6).

<sup>188</sup> U literaturi, krčki su nalazi kartirani na više načina; bez tipološke razlikovnosti (Teržan 1984a: 111, Fig. 1; Palavestra 1992: 382, M. 1, 2. Forenbaher 1995: 275-276: Fig. 5); tipološki podijeljeni tipovima Tiryns i Allumiere (Harding 1984: 75, 83; Bouzek 1985: 172-173; 1997: Fig. 34; Negroni Catacchio 1989: 660-661; Bellintani 1997: 119, Fig. 2; Cultraro 2006: Fig. 1; Negroni Catacchio et al. 2006: Fig. 7; Teržan 2007: 161-162, Pl. XXXVIa). Nažalost, kod većine autora koja se bavila jantarnim perlama s otoka Krka nisu razlikovani nalazi iz Krka (općenito) od onih i iz Baške. Uglavnom su sve perle smještene pod nalazište Baška, iako u izvornoj objavi F. Lo Schiavo točno navodi odakle koje potječu (Lo Schiavo 1970: 424-427).

<sup>189</sup> Palavestra 1992: 388. Isto za nalaze iz Dalmacije preuzima i V. Barbarić, niti ne spominjući nalaze iz Baške ili Krka (Barbarić 2009: 318), iako cijeli Kvarner teritorijalno i zemljopisno tretira u sastavu sjeverne Dalmacije?!

<sup>190</sup> Negroni Catacchio 1984a: 89; Negroni Catacchio 1984b: 146; Negroni Catacchio 1989: 659-696; Hughes-Brock 1993: 221-224; Bergonzi 1997: 606-608; Bellintani 2010: 143; Angelini, Bellintani 2005; Bellintani, Usai, Fadda 2012: 1166-1170. U 8 primjera zabilježena je zajednička prisutnost tipa Tiryns i Allumiere, što svjedoči o njihovoj kronološkoj istovrijednosti.

<sup>191</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1997: 595-601; Bettelli 2002: 122; Eder, Jung 2005: 487. O metrološkom doprinosu paneuropskoj *koiné metallurgica* vidjeti zanimljive usporedbe kod C. F. E. Pare (1999) i P. Turk (2001).

Allumiere types (Harding 1984: 75, 83; Bouzek 1985: 172-173; 1997: Fig. 34; Negroni Catacchio 1989: 660-661; Bellintani 1997: 119, Fig. 2; Cultraro 2006: Fig. 1; Negroni Catacchio et al. 2006: Fig. 7; Teržan 2007: 161-162, Pl. XXXVIa). Unfortunately majority of authors dealing with the beads from the island of Krk did not separate the finds from Krk (generally) from those from Baška – general all beads were listed as being from Baška although in the original publication F. Lo Schiavo clearly indicated their location of origin (Lo Schiavo 1970: 424-427).

<sup>189</sup> Palavestra 1992: 388. The same is accepted for Dalmatia by V. Barbarić without mentioning the finds from Baška or Krk (Barbarić 2009: 318), although he considers the whole region of Kvarner to be an integral part of north Dalmatia?!

<sup>190</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1997: 595-601; Bettelli 2002: 122; Eder, Jung 2005: 487. Regarding the metrological contribution to the pan European *koiné metallurgica* see interesting comparisons in C. F. E. Pare (1999) and P. Turk (2001).

<sup>191</sup> Cultraro 2006: 1548-1550.

<sup>192</sup> Negroni Catacchio 1984a: 89; Negroni Catacchio 1984b: 146; Negroni Catacchio 1989: 659-696; Hughes-Brock 1993: 221-224; Bergonzi 1997: 606-608; Bellintani 2010: 143; Angelini, Bellintani 2005; Bellintani, Usai, Fadda 2012: 1166-1170. In 8 cases the joint presence of Tiryns and Allumiere type is documented demonstrating their chronological contemporaneity.

<sup>193</sup> Negroni Catacchio 1976: 21-57; Negroni Catacchio 1978: 83-85; Negroni Catacchio 1984a: 85; Negroni Catacchio 1984b: 145; Harding 1984: 85; Bietti Sestieri 1997: 765.

<sup>194</sup> Bellintani 2010: 143; Salzani, Colonna 2010.

čak *koiné dell' ambra*, kako se u novije vrijeme pretpostavlja.<sup>192</sup> Njihova je proizvodnja, naime, na području sojencičarskih naselja delte rijeke Po,<sup>193</sup> sada već potpuno uvažena, što se izdašnije potvrđuje svakim novim istraživanjem nalazišta osobito frattesinskog okruženja,<sup>194</sup> i što je najvjerojatnije odlučujuća činjenica za nalaze perli iz nalazišta obale istočnoga Jadrana.

Komplementarnost nalaza perli obaju tipova karakteristična je, dakle, na području srednjeg Sredozemlja i jadranskog bazena, upravo od Frattesine i Bismantove s jedne, do Privlake s druge strane (sl. 25), a koja perlama iz Baške i Krka samo dobiva još više na značenju. Ujedno, i prema tipologiji A. Palavestre ti nalazi pokazuju najviše dodirnih točaka.<sup>195</sup> Pored dobro poznatih italskih te najbrojnijih sardinijskih nalazišta,<sup>196</sup> a zbog zastupljenosti i Tiryns i Allumiere tipova perli, vrijedan isticanja revidirani je nalaz takve kombinacije iz tholosa B na Metaxati, na otoku Kephalleniji<sup>197</sup> i nešto noviji nalaz iz nekropole Hordeevka, kurgan 38, u udaljenoj Ukrajini (sl. 25).<sup>198</sup> Potonje nas jantarne ogrlice upućuju ujedno na nekoliko novih momenata. Prostorno, izričito ukazuju na kontakte svladanih prostranstava širokih razmjera, a kulturološki svakako izravan utjecaj egejskog/sredozemnog trenda prestiža na sjeverno zaleđe crnomorske obale koji se, zapravo do serije novijih nalaza s crnomorskog područja, razmatrao s velikom skepsom. Ali, perle tipa Allumiere ukazuju i na posredan utjecaj ili doticaj sa srednjomediterranskim prostorom, na kojem su najčešće zastupljene, gdje su se na koncu i proizvodile. O distribuciji jantara, kao i o drugim primjerima koji povezuju Hordeevku s europskim kasnobrončano-dobnim nalazima raspravljao je A. Harding.<sup>199</sup> Međutim, izostavio je relativno noviji nalaz upravo perli tipa Allumiere iz Kastre na otoku Thasos,<sup>200</sup> kao i perli iz Dridu u Rumunjskoj (sl. 25),<sup>201</sup> koje su vrijedne dodatne pozornosti jer se, s obzirom na stanje istraženosti i uzorak poznate građe, vjerojatno preko današnjeg rumunjskog prostora odvijao velik dio posredovanja središnjeg i zapadnog dijela europskog kontinenta s crnomorskim područjima. Odbaciti se zasigurno ne može niti pretpostavka M. Cultrara o kontinentalnim putovima i preko područja južnoga Balkana, oživljavajući tako vrlo rano postojanje žive prometnice koja će u povijest ući pod nazivom *Via Egnatia*,<sup>202</sup> za što mu dodatan argument pružaju noviji nalazi jantarnih perli iz Albanije te svakako s otoka Thasos.<sup>203</sup>

of beads on sites of the eastern Adriatic coast.

The complementarity of beads of both types is characteristic for the northern Adriatic area and its hinterlands – exactly from Frattesina and Bismantova on one side, and Privlaka from the other (fig. 25). Some additional importance to the model observed is stressed by the beads from Baška and Krk. At the same time, according to the typology of A. Palavestra, these finds show the highest degree of similarity.<sup>195</sup> Alongside the well-known Italian and most numerous Sardinian sites<sup>196</sup> due to the presence of both, the Tiryns and Allumiere types, it is worth mentioning the revised find of such a combination from the tholos B at Metaxati on the island of Cephalonia<sup>197</sup> and a more recent find from the necropolis at Hordeevka, kurgan 38, in the distant Ukraine (fig. 25).<sup>198</sup> These amber necklaces point at several new facts. In spatial terms they demonstrate the scale of the long distance trade, but in cultural terms they show the direct influence of the Aegean/Mediterranean trend of prestigious goods on the hinterland of the Black Sea, which was considered with great scepticism until a line of more recent discoveries took place. However, the beads of Allumiere type indicate also an indirect influence or contact with the central Mediterranean area, where the latter were most numerous discovered and finally also produced. A. Harding discussed this distribution of artefacts and amber finds which connect Hordeevka with European Late Bronze Age finds,<sup>199</sup> but unfortunately he overlooked the new finds of the Allumiere type beads from Kastrá on the island of Thasos<sup>200</sup> and the beads from Dridu in Romania (fig. 25).<sup>201</sup> The latter is an important find since, according to the state of research and the known sample of finds, it was most likely today's Romanian territory that played a connecting role between the territory of Central and Eastern Europe and the Black sea hinterland. Of course, we cannot fully reject the notions by M. Cultraro on the continental trading routes across the southern Balkans, reviving in this way the idea of a very early existence of a lively route which will later enter history under the name of *Via Egnatia*.<sup>202</sup> Further confirmation of this idea can be sought in the recent finds of amber beads in Albania and of course on the island of Thasos.<sup>203</sup> Finally, the beads from Hordeevka are important since their dating in the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> century represents the upper chronological limitation of their appearance and confirms their chronological equivalent to LHIII C period.<sup>204</sup> On the neighbouring territory such a dating is confirmed by the hoard of Debeli vrh which is located a bit to the north and includes an amber bead of the Tiryns type I dated in to the II<sup>nd</sup> horizon of hoards,

<sup>192</sup> Cultraro 2006: 1548-1550.

<sup>193</sup> Negroni Catacchio 1976: 21-57; Negroni Catacchio 1978: 83-85; Negroni Catacchio 1984a: 85; Negroni Catacchio 1984b: 145; Harding 1984: 85; Bietti Sestieri 1997: 765.

<sup>194</sup> Bellintani 2010, 143; Salzani, Colonna 2010.

<sup>195</sup> Palavestra 1992: M. 1; Palavestra 1993: 183, 202; Palavestra 2006: 43, Fig. 44.

<sup>196</sup> Kako je prikazano i na karti rasprostiranja (sl. 25) sardinijska su nalazišta najbogatija nalazima zrna obaju tipova, i to najčešće u kombinaciji, a rjeđe pojedinačno. Takvo je stanje posljedica opsežnih i sustavnih novijih istraživanja, koje je ujedno pridonijelo učvršćivanju hipoteze o mogućnosti proizvodnje tog tipa jantarnih zrna i na Sardiniji (Negrone Catacchio et al 2006: 1460-1461).

<sup>197</sup> Cultraro 2006: 1536.

<sup>198</sup> Berezanskaja, Kločko 1998: T. 31, 58, 12-15, 66, 6; 76, 2-3, 77, 3, 78, 1; Metzner-Nebelsick 2005: Abb. 4a, P6, 307-308; Dörrer 2008: 558-559, Abb. 10.

<sup>199</sup> Harding 2007: 50-51.

<sup>200</sup> Cultraro 2006: 1541, Fig. 3: 3.

<sup>201</sup> Boroffka 2001: 399-403, Abb. 3: 14-37; Teržan 2007: 162, Pl. XXXVIa; Dörrer 2008: 560-561, Abb. 11: 2.

<sup>202</sup> Cultraro 2006: 1549.

<sup>203</sup> Unatoč donošenju brojnih novih, ali i starih, iscrpno komentiranih nalaza jantarnih perli iz šireg egejskog svijeta, Cultraro je poznavanje balkanskog prostora iznenađujuće površno, poglavito kada je riječ o sjevernojadranskom bazenu. Tako su lokaliteti iz prostora R. Hrvatske, inače niz godina poznati u znanstvenoj literaturi, mahom smješteni u Bosnu(!). Veliki nedostatak njegovom opsežnom istraživanju svakako je i neadekvatno kartiranje čijem nerazu-

<sup>195</sup> Palavestra 1992: M. 1; Palavestra 1993: 183, 202; Palavestra 2006: 43, Fig. 44.

<sup>196</sup> As demonstrated on the distribution map (fig. 25) the sites in Sardinia have yielded most plentiful both types, mostly in combination and rarely individual finds. Consequently, the state of research is the outcome of extensive and systematic new research which contributed to the strengthening of the argument about a possibility of production of those beads right on Sardinia (Negrone Catacchio et al 2006: 1460-1461).

<sup>197</sup> Cultraro 2006: 1536.

<sup>198</sup> Berezanskaja, Kločko 1998: T. 31, 58, 12-15, 66, 6; 76, 2-3, 77, 3, 78, 1; Metzner-Nebelsick 2005: Abb. 4a, P6, 307-308; Dörrer 2008: 558-559, Abb. 10.

<sup>199</sup> Harding 2007: 50-51.

<sup>200</sup> Cultraro 2006: 1541, Fig. 3: 3.

<sup>201</sup> Boroffka 2001: 399-403, Abb. 3: 14-37; Teržan 2007: 162, Pl. XXXVIa; Dörrer 2008: 560-561, Abb. 11: 2.

<sup>202</sup> Cultraro 2006: 1549.

<sup>203</sup> Despite the presentation of new and also old finds and the exhaustive commentaries about finds from the broader Aegean area Cultraro's knowledge about the Balkan area is surprisingly superficial, especially when talking about the central Adriatic basin. The localities from the territory of Croatia, although for years known in the scientific literature were located into Bosnia(!). A problem of his extensive research is of course also incorrect mapping of sites and a lack of sites in the list.

<sup>204</sup> Harding 2007: 50; Teržan 2007: 159, 162.



**Slika 27.** Inventar groba XXXI iz Bismantove (prema Bietti Sestieri 1997).

**Figure 27.** Inventory of the grave XXXI from Bismantova (after Bietti Sestieri 1997).

Napokon, perle iz Hordeevke važne su i zato što je ondje omogućeno sigurno određenje gornje granice njihova modna nastupanja. Tako su radiometričkim datiranjem smještene u sredinu 12. stoljeća, što je samo dodatno potvrdilo njihov kronološki ekvivalent KHIIC razdoblju.<sup>204</sup> Na obližnjem području, takvoj dataciji pogoduje i nešto sjevernija ostava Debeli Vrh, koja je dakle s nalazom jantarne perle tipa Tiryns datirana u II. horizont ostava, HaA1 stupnja prema P. Turku.<sup>205</sup> Donja im je granica smještena u rani HaB1 stupanj, kako nalazima iz ostave Dridu, tako i nalazima iz šireg padanskog i alpskog prostora,<sup>206</sup> osobito na nalazištu Hauterive-Champréveyres gdje su dobro datirane u horizont HaA2/B1,<sup>207</sup> čime je definirana i njihova donja granica korištenja na tome nalazištu.<sup>208</sup>

Izuzev jantarnih, pozornost privlače i koštane, pločaste perle iz Baške (kat. 12, sl. 20), koje tako obilježavaju iznimne pojave na prostoru Kvarnera, barem iz perspektive dosadašnjeg stanja istraživanja. Na nalazištima iz šireg okruženja toga vremena zabilježen

to HaA1 according to P. Turk.<sup>205</sup> Their lower boundary of appearance is dated to the early HaB1 as demonstrated by the finds from the hoard in Dridu, as well as the finds from the broader Padaniana and Alpine territory<sup>206</sup> – especially of the site Hauterive-Champréveyres where they were dated in to the horizon HaA2/B1,<sup>207</sup> determining their lower boundary of appearance on this site.<sup>208</sup>

Apart from amber beads, it was flat bone beads that attracted much attention denoting exceptional finds in the Kvarner area, at least from the point of view of the current state of research. They are numerous on the sites of that period (cat. 12, fig. 20) and should be interpreted within the category of parts of costume. Alongside beads from other materials, both in the Aegean cultural area and in Italian contexts they are defined as parts of luxury female or infants attires,<sup>209</sup> which is also a mark of the grave inventories from Frattesina – for example in Narde, graves 75 and 519, and Bismantova graves XXVIII and XXXI (fig. 27-28).<sup>210</sup> It is ingrained that they were a local product, like glass

mijevanju doprinosi i manjak popisa nalazišta.

<sup>204</sup> Harding 2007: 50; Teržan 2007: 159, 162.

<sup>205</sup> Turk 1996: 108.

<sup>206</sup> Dörner 2008: 561; Bellintani 2010.

<sup>207</sup> Rychner-Faraggi 1993:66-68, Pl. 124: 6-7; Hochuli 1998: 293-294, Abb. 161: 13-14.

<sup>208</sup> Usp. Allumiere perle sa sojeničarskim bačvastim perlama dalje u tekstu.

<sup>205</sup> Turk 1996: 108.


<sup>206</sup> Dörner 2008: 561; Bellintani 2010.

<sup>207</sup> Rychner-Faraggi 1993:66-68, Pl. 124: 6-7; Hochuli 1998: 293-294, Abb. 161: 13-14.

<sup>208</sup> Compare the beads of Allumiere type with the barrel shaped "pfahlbauten perlen" further in the text.

<sup>209</sup> Comp. Primas 2011: 126-128.

<sup>210</sup> Salzani 1991: 145, Fig. 16-18; Eder, Jung 2005: 490; Catarsi, Dall'Aglio 1978: 45;



**Slika 28.** Bogati ženski grob 75 frattesinske nekropole Narde (prema Salzani, Colonna 2010).

**Figure 28.** Rich female's grave 75 from the necropolis of Narde (Frattesina) (after Salzani, Colonna 2010).

ih je velik broj, i također su interpretirane u kategoriji dijela nošnje. U egejskom su kulturnom krugu jednako kao i u italjskim kontekstima definirane, uz perle od ostalih materijala, luksuznim dijelovima nakitnih garnitura ženskih ili dječjih pokopa,<sup>209</sup> što je zapravo obilježje i inventara grobova Frattesine, npr. u Narde, grob 75 i 519, i Bismantove, grobovi XXVIII i XXXI (sl. 27-28).<sup>210</sup> Uvriježeno je da su one, pored staklenih perli, bile mjesnim proizvodom i obilježjem frattesinske produkcije. Naprotiv, niske od koštanah sitnih perli česte su u, također, ženskim grobovima istarskog poluotoka<sup>211</sup> i nerijetko su se nalazile uz narukvice dvoslivnog presjeka. Iako se

beads, and a characteristic of the production from Frattesina. On the other hand, strings of miniature bone beads are frequent in the graves on the Istrian peninsula,<sup>211</sup> and are often accompanied by bracelets with a double-pitch cross-section. Although they sporadically appear also in the following phase, they mark the I. phase of the Iron Age of Istria.<sup>212</sup>

Glass beads which were present on the broader territory of *Caput Adriae* have to be considered into more detail. They can be found in almost every larger necropolis or among the individual finds. Also the representative sets of attire from the already mentioned graves

<sup>209</sup> Usp. Primas 2011: 126-128.

<sup>210</sup> Salzani 1991: 145, Fig. 16-18; Eder, Jung 2005: 490; Catarsi, Dall'Aglio 1978: 45; Bietti Sestieri 1997: 765; Negroni Catacchio 2009: 196-198.

<sup>211</sup> Zabilježene su i na nekropoli S. Barbara (Elleri), grob 8 (Montagnari Kokelj 1997: 149, T. 23: 8:7).

Bietti Sestieri 1997: 765; Negroni Catacchio 2009: 196-198.

<sup>211</sup> They were discovered on the necropolis of S. Barbara (Elleri) in grave number 8 (Montagnari Kokelj 1997: 149, T. 23: 8:7).

<sup>212</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 54, 57, T. 23: 6, 42: 12...; Matošević, Mihovilić 2004: 10, T. 2: 6, T. 3: 18.

sporadično pojavljuju i u sljedećoj fazi, označavaju I. fazu željeznog doba Istre.<sup>212</sup>

Detaljnije se opet treba posvetiti staklenim perlama kojih na širem području *Caput Adriae* ne nedostaje. Nalazimo ih kod gotovo svake istraživane nekropole ili uz pojedinačne nalaze. Tako su i reprezentativne nakitne garniture iz spominjanih grobova nekropola Bismantove i Narde imala i ogrlicu od okruglih staklenih perli (sl. 27-28), baš kao i grob iz Privlake, gdje je bilo nađeno 12 primjeraka zeleno-plavih perli.<sup>213</sup> Naime, općenito se staklene perle mogu razlikovati u dvije skupine, monokromne i polikromne, a s tipološkog aspekta dijele se dalje u tri tipa s varijantama.<sup>214</sup> Najčešće su se koristile upravo prstenaste ili diskaste te okrugle male perle, prirodno svijetle, najčešće tamnoplave ali i zelene boje. Određene su tipom I, i iz prostora jadranskog priobalja poznati su nalazi iz nekropole Sv. Barbare/Elleri<sup>215</sup> te perle iz nekropole Limske gradine,<sup>216</sup> koje valja pridružiti nalazima iz Osora, te monokromnim perlama iz Dalmacije; pored Privlake, 5 prstenastih i diskastih plavih perli iz Vranjica kod Solina te 16 primjeraka svijetloplavih perli iz Babinog polja na otoku Mljetu.<sup>217</sup> Iz novijih istraživanja dodaju im se i 3 perle iz groba I/4 s Kose kod Ljubča.<sup>218</sup> U tipološkom smislu to se odnosi i na nalaze iz škocjanske nekropole Brežec, bogati ženski grob 155,<sup>219</sup> zatim dalje iz grobova u Ljubljani<sup>220</sup> i Novem Mestu<sup>221</sup> te sjeveroistočnije, do luksuzno opremljenog groba 7 iz nekropole u Ormožu.<sup>222</sup> Svima njima nalaze se izvanredne paralele na prostoru italskog kopna, osobito kod nekropola Frattesine, Fondo Zanotto i Narde,<sup>223</sup> zatim iz Mariconda di Melara,<sup>224</sup> dalje iz grobova Bismantove,<sup>225</sup> sve do šireg srednjeg i zapadnoalpskog područja.<sup>226</sup>

No u doista važnim i istaknutijim grobnim cjelinama frattesinskog područja uz te su se perlice, kao iznimni pokazatelji nalazile i polikromne bačvaste, tzv. sojeničarske perle (sl. 29). Njih poznajemo i iz istaknutih grobova 57 i 60 nekropole Limske gradine,<sup>227</sup> gdje predstavljaju iznimnu skupinu perli II. tipa koje se, s obzirom na oblik i način izvedbe provlačenja niti, mogu dalje razlikovati u

from Bismantova and Narde included necklaces composed of round glass beads (fig. 27-28) – identical to the grave from Privlaka where 12 beads of greenish-blue color were discovered.<sup>213</sup> In fact, they could be generally distinguished into two groups according to their colour and production – they form a monochrome and a polychrome group. From their typological point of view they might be distinguished into three types with additional variants.<sup>214</sup> Most frequent were small monochrome ring-shaped beads of discoid and round cross-section. They were of a naturally light, mostly blue or green, colour. They are defined as *Type 1*, and from the Adriatic coastal region, they were known from the necropolis of St. Barbara /Elleri in the gulf of Trieste<sup>215</sup> and from the necropolis of Limska Gradina in Istria.<sup>216</sup> Also the finds of monochrome beads from Dalmatia should be added into this group; besides Privlaka, 5 blue ring-shaped and discoid beads were discovered in Vranjic near Solin, and 16 ring-shaped light blue beads in Babinog polje on the island of Mljet.<sup>217</sup> During recent research in northern Dalmatia, 3 beads were discovered in the grave I/4 from Kosa near Ljubča.<sup>218</sup> In the typological sense such were the finds from the rich female grave number 155 from necropolis Brežec in Škocjan,<sup>219</sup> further from graves in Ljubljana<sup>220</sup> and Novo Mesto,<sup>221</sup> as well as to the north-east from the luxuriously equipped grave number 7 from the necropolis in Ormož.<sup>222</sup> With regard to their typological characteristics, all these beads have excellent comparisons on the Italic peninsula, especially on necropoles of the Frattesina territory – from Fondo Zanotto and Narde,<sup>223</sup> from Mariconda di Melara,<sup>224</sup> from the graves in Bismantova,<sup>225</sup> and all the way around from the broader Central and Western Alpine territory.<sup>226</sup>

However, alongside those beads, in more prominent and important graves of the Frattesina territory also polychromous barrel-shaped types of beads as exceptional indicators were found - the so-called pile-dwellings beads (fig. 29). In this sense it is very interesting to expose the graves 60 and 57 from the necropolis of Limska Gradina.<sup>227</sup> They represent an interesting group designated as the *Type II*. Due to their size and drawing of the thread, they can be divided into two variants. We have to add also a further find of a greenish bead with a white chord from the distant grave 289 from

<sup>212</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 54, 57, T. 23: 6, 42: 12...; Matošević, Mihovilić 2004: 10, T. 2: 6, T. 3: 18.

<sup>213</sup> Batović 1980: 38; Batović 1983a: 315; zagubljene ili propale? (AMZd)

<sup>214</sup> Tipološka podjela oslanja se na prijedlog talijanskih istraživača, npr. Bellintani, Stefan 2009; tipologija za prostor sjevernog Jadrana i zaleda detaljno je razrađena kod Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2014.

<sup>215</sup> Montagnari Kokelj 1997: 150, T. 24, T. 17: 5.

<sup>216</sup> Mihovilić 1972: T. 12: 16-17; T. 26: 24.

<sup>217</sup> Marović 1967: 8, Fig. 1: 2; Marović 1969: 18-19, Fig. 7; Batović 1983b: 345, T. XLVIII: 8-12; Batović 1983c: 363, Fig. 24: 6, T. LI: 6-7. One su konzervativno smatrane jedinim nalazištima toga tipa građe iz kultura istočne obale Jadrana (Forenbaher 1995: 77, Fig. 14-17; Barbarić 2009: 318)!

<sup>218</sup> Vujević 2011: 10-11, T. III: 3.

<sup>219</sup> Vitri 1977: 91, kat. 39.

<sup>220</sup> Starè 1954: 64, T. XLVI: 7; Puš 1971: 30, T. 16: 13; Puš 1982: 36, 38, T. 25: 8; T. 27: 8.

<sup>221</sup> Knez 1984: T. 4: 1; Križ 1995: 38, kat. 37; 57, kat. 113; Bricelj 2003: 60, T. 24: 2; T. 29: 5.

<sup>222</sup> Tomanič-Jevremov 1989: 282, T. 16: 5.

<sup>223</sup> De Min 1984: T. X: 30; XI, 4; Salzani 1992: Fig. 17: 19, 21; 18: 6-7; 22: 5, 9, 10; 24: 3, 8; 31: 4; 40: 4; 41: 10; 45: 15 itd; Salzani, Colonna 2010: T. 7: 21-22; T. 13: 17; T. 21: 3 itd.; usp. Bietti Sestieri 1997: 765, Fig. 449; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 72.

<sup>224</sup> Towle et al. 2001: Fig. 6: 36-39.

<sup>225</sup> Catarsi, Dall'Aglio 1978: T. XIX: 6; T. XXI: 2; Bietti Sestieri 1997: Fig. 453; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 81, Fig. 2a.

<sup>226</sup> Ističu se najreprezentativniji i kemijski analizirani primjerci, npr. Salorno, Hauterive-Champréveyres, Allendorf (Rychner-Faraggi 1993: 64, Fig. X, XII, 78; Rychner 1998: 292; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 81-82, Fig. 3-5; usp. Towle et al. 2001; sa starijom literaturom).

<sup>227</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 29-30, 33, T. 26; T. 30; Majnarić-Pandžić 1998: Sl. 44; Mihovilić 2012: Fig. 5-6; Mihovilić 2013: 140-142, Sl. 72, Sl. 81.

<sup>213</sup> Batović 1980: 38; Batović 1983a: 315; lost or ruined? (AMZd).

<sup>214</sup> The typological division is based on the proposals by Italian researchers (e.g. Bellintani, Stefan 2009), and a detailed description of the northern Adriatic and its hinterland was made by Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2014.

<sup>215</sup> Montagnari Kokelj 1997: 150, T. 24, T. 17: 5.

<sup>216</sup> Mihovilić 1972: T. 12: 16-17; T. 26: 24.

<sup>217</sup> Marović 1967: 8, Fig. 1: 2; Marović 1969: 18-19, Fig. 7; Batović 1983b: 345, T. XLVIII: 8-12; Batović 1983c: 363, Fig. 24: 6, T. LI: 6-7). They were conventional considered being the only sites with such finds from cultures of the Eastern Adriatic coast (Forenbaher 1995: 77, Fig. 14-17; Barbarić 2009: 318)!

<sup>218</sup> Vujević 2011: 10-11, T. III: 3.

<sup>219</sup> Vitri 1977: 91, kat. 39.

<sup>220</sup> Starè 1954: 64, T. XLVI: 7; Puš 1971: 30, T. 16: 13; Puš 1982: 36, 38, T. 25: 8; T. 27: 8.

<sup>221</sup> Knez 1984: T. 4: 1; Križ 1995: 38, kat. 37; 57, kat. 113; Bricelj 2003: 60, T. 24: 2; T. 29: 5.

<sup>222</sup> Tomanič-Jevremov 1989: 282, T. 16: 5.


<sup>223</sup> De Min 1984: T. X: 30; XI, 4; Salzani 1992: Fig. 17: 19, 21; 18: 6-7; 22: 5, 9, 10; 24: 3, 8; 31: 4; 40: 4; 41: 10; 45: 15 etc; Salzani, Colonna 2010: T. 7: 21-22; T. 13: 17; T. 21: 3 etc.; comp. Bietti Sestieri 1997: 765, Fig. 449; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 72.

<sup>224</sup> Towle et al. 2001: Fig. 6: 36-39.

<sup>225</sup> Catarsi, Dall'Aglio 1978: T. XIX: 6; T. XXI: 2; Bietti Sestieri 1997: Fig. 453; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 81, Fig. 2a.

<sup>226</sup> Only the most representative and chemically analyzed finds are taken into consideration. For example: Salorno, Hauterive-Champréveyres, Allendorf (Rychner-Faraggi 1993: 64, Fig. X; XII, 78; Rychner 1998: 292; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 81-82, Fig. 3-5; comp. Towle et al. 2001 – with older literature).

<sup>227</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 29-30, 33, T. 26; T. 30; Majnarić-Pandžić 1998: Sl. 44; Mihovilić 2012: Fig. 5-6; Mihovilić 2013: 140-142, Sl. 72; Sl. 81.



**Slika 29.** Karta prostorne raširenosti staklenih bačvastih perli i perli s okcima (nadopunjeno prema Bellintani 2011; Blečić Kavur 2012b).

**Figure 29.** Distribution map of glass barrel-shaped and circular beads with "eyes" (supplemented after Bellintani 2011; Blečić Kavur 2012b).

dvije varijante. Pridružiti im valja nalaz zelenkaste perle s bijelom niti iz groba 289 nekropole u Dobovi.<sup>228</sup> Riječ je o ukopu odrasle ženske osobe, prestižnom i jednom od najbogatijih te nekropole, kao što je to obilježje i repertoar nalaza iz groba 57 nekropole Limske gradine (sl. 30). Našim primjercima u potpunosti istovjetni primjeri potječu iz prostora Frattesine – samog naselja, nekropola i okolnih povezanih nalazišta (sl. 28).<sup>229</sup> Isto možemo vidjeti i kod drugih dobro datiranih italskih i alpskih, pogotovo sojencičarskih nalazišta.<sup>230</sup> Pa iako su one poznate već i od BrD stupnja, većinom nastupaju za tzv. bogatog horizonta HaA2 i HaA2/B1, a zadržat će se u uporabi samo tijekom HaB1/B2 stupnjeva,<sup>231</sup> zbog čega su i tretirane, sukladno njihovim kontekstima, unutar istarske I.a, ali dobovske II. relativne kronološke faze.<sup>232</sup>

Dobova.<sup>228</sup> The latter burial was that of an adult female and is one of the most prestigious and wealthy graves of the necropolis, a situation similar to the one in grave 57 in the necropolis of Limska Gradina (fig. 30). Identical beads were discovered on the territory of Frattesina – from the settlement, necropolis and from the surrounding related sites (fig. 28).<sup>229</sup> They could be observed also on other well dated sites, mostly pile dwellings in Italy and in the Alps.<sup>230</sup> Although they appear from BrD onwards, they are most numerous in the so called "wealthy horizon" of the HaA2/B1 period, whereas they remain in use only in the HaB1/B2 phase.<sup>231</sup> Consequently, they were discussed in the Istrian Ia and the Dobova II regional phases.<sup>232</sup>

<sup>228</sup> Starè 1975: 34, T. 41: 3; Gabrovec 1983: 56, T. VII: 16.

<sup>229</sup> De Min 1984: T. X: 28-29; Salzani 1992: Fig. 13: 7; 24: 3; 29: 9; Salzani, Colonna 2010: T. 8: 6; usp. Towle et al. 2001: 11-14, Fig. 6: 41-44; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 75-77; Bellintani 2011: 268-271, Fig. 4: 19-20.

<sup>230</sup> Npr. Hauterive, Cortaillod, Lausanne, itd. Rychner-Farragi 1993: 64-65, Fig. XI, XII, XVI, 78; Rychner 1998: 292-293; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 80-83, Fig. 3-6; Bellintani 2011: Fig. 4: 1, 7, 12-14, 17; Bellintani, Usai 2012: 1128, Fig. 1: 11.

<sup>231</sup> Bellintani et al. 2006: 1507, 1513, Fig. 2.

<sup>232</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 44-45; Mihovilić 2001a: 50; Teržan 1995: 338-339, fn. 45-47; usp. Belardelli et al. 1990: 193-195. Budući da su te perle pouzdano datirane u švicarskom sojencičarskim nalazištima, u Hauterive-Champréveyres su zabilježene zajedno s jantarnim zrnima tipa Allumiere (Rychner-Faraggi 1993: 63-65; Rychner 1998: 291-293), baš kao i u Frattesini (Bietti Sestieri 1984: 413-427; Bellintani 1997: 122-128; Towle et al. 2001: Fig. 6-8), mogu u ovome primjeru poslužiti i kao datacijski supstituti ili precizniji kronološki oslonac. Kako one predstavljaju izravni import, najvjerojatnije iz Frattesine gdje su se, dakle, i proizvodile, grob 57 iz limske nekropole treba datirati u HaA2, tj. u drugu polovinu 12. stoljeća korigirane periodizacije. Isto podrazumijeva da bi se novije

<sup>228</sup> Starè 1975: 34, T. 41: 3; Gabrovec 1983: 56, T. VII: 16.


<sup>229</sup> De Min 1984: T. X: 28-29; Salzani 1992: Fig. 13: 7; 24: 3; 29: 9; Salzani, Colonna 2010: T. 8: 6; comp. Towle et al. 2001: 11-14, Fig. 6: 41-44; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 75-77; Bellintani 2011: 268-271, Fig. 4: 19-20.

<sup>230</sup> For example: Hauterive, Cortaillod, Lausanne etc. Rychner-Farragi 1993: 64-65, Fig. XI, XII, XVI, 78; Rychner 1998: 292-293; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 80-83, Fig. 3-6; Bellintani 2011: Fig. 4: 1, 7, 12-14, 17; Bellintani, Usai 2012: 1128, Fig. 1: 11.

<sup>231</sup> Bellintani et al. 2006: 1507, 1513, Fig. 2.

<sup>232</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 44-45; Mihovilić 2001a: 50; Teržan 1995: 338-339, fn. 45-47; comp. Belardelli et al. 1990: 193-195. Since these beads are well dated on the Swiss pile dwelling sites, in Hauterive-Champréveyres they were discovered together with amber beads of the Allumiere type (Rychner-Faraggi 1993: 63-65; Rychner 1998: 291-293) as well as in Frattesina (Bietti Sestieri 1984: 413-427; Bellintani 1997: 122-128; Towle et al. 2001: Fig. 6-8) they could be used as a datational substitute and a precise chronological milestone. Since they are a direct import, most probably from Frattesina where they were produced, the grave number 57 from the necropolis on Limska Gradina should be dated at least in to HaA2/B1, or in to the second half of 12<sup>th</sup> century and in the 11<sup>th</sup> century of the corrected periodization. This means only that also





**Slika 30.** Inventar bogatog groba 57 iz nekropole Limske gradine (prema Mihovilić 1972; Mihovilić 2012).

**Figure 30.** Inventory of the rich grave 57 from necropolis of Limska Gradina (after Mihovilić 1972; Mihovilić 2012).

U vremenu, druge polovine 11. i tijekom čitavog 10. stoljeća (Ha B1/B2), na predmetnom se području, no na samo određenim i malobrojnim nalazištima, izdvajaju i okrugle polikromne perle koje su klasificirane kao tip III, s obzirom na izvedeni ukras profiliranog i optočenog ispupčenog ornamenta, tzv. okca (sl. 29). Njihov nam broj i način izvedbe sugerira razlikovanje više varijanti, a odstupaju one glavne sa tri (tip IIIa) i sa četiri okca (tipa IIIb). Naime, pri istraživanju ljubljanske nekropole SAZU, grob 13, nađena je tamnoplava perla sa četiri bijela okca,<sup>233</sup> gotovo identična onoj od crnog stakla iz groba 67 limske nekropole.<sup>234</sup> Njima, tj. tipu IIIb, pridružuje se i nalaz tirkiznoplave perle s izrazito profiliranim okcima iz Podosojne peći (kat. 104).<sup>235</sup> Riječ je o specifičnom nalazu i po samom nalaženju unutar vatrišta kasno-brončanodobnog sloja te špilje, nađenog zajedno s izduženim saltaleonom (kat. 105). Od te tri perle, koje se razlikuju prirodnom bojom stakla, čini se da će morfologijom i izvedbom ukrašavanja tipološki, i vjerojatno kronološki, stariju verziju predstavljati perle iz Podosojne peći i iz ljubljanske nekropole. Budući da se one

datacije trebale primijeniti i na korekciju stupnjeva i podstupnjeva kronologije Istre koji su usklađeni s klasičnom srednjoeuropskom periodizacijom, pa bi faze Istra Ia i Ib trebale biti pomaknute u 12. i u cijelo 11. stoljeće. Perla iz Dobove imaće kako tipološki tako i kontekstom nižu apsolutno kronološku poziciju HaA2/B1 11. stoljeća.

<sup>233</sup> Starè 1954: 30, T. XIV: 3.

<sup>234</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 35, T. 32: 10.

<sup>235</sup> Starac 1994: 22, P. XIII: 5.

In the period of the second half of the 11<sup>th</sup> and whole of the 10<sup>th</sup> century BC (HaB1-B2) circular polychromous beads appear on the territory under discussion, but only on appointed sites. They were determined as *Type III* according to the decoration of the profiled and surrounded bulged ornament of the so called eye (fig. 29). Their number and technology of production suggest the recognition of different variants. Two larger groups are those with three (type IIIa) or four eyes (type IIIb). Namely, a bead made from dark blue glass with four "eyes" encircled with a white tread was discovered in grave 13 from the necropolis SAZU in Ljubljana,<sup>233</sup> a find almost identical to the one made from black glass from grave 67 of the necropolis of Limska Gradina.<sup>234</sup> We could add to this group, the Type IIIb, also the find of a turquoise-blue bead with distinctly profiled eyes from Cave Podosojna peć on the eastern side of Istria (cat. 104).<sup>235</sup> It was discovered in a Late Bronze Age fireplace in a cave, together with an elongated saltaleone (cat. 105). Among the three beads, differing only in the natural colour of the glass, it seems that due to their morphology and execution of decoration, the beads from Podosojna peć and Ljubljana represent older examples. Since they differ from all the other known Type IIIb examples, which belong generally to the youngest form (IIIb2), the closest comparisons, could be observed again to the Frattesina complex, especially the necropolis of Narde (fig. 28),<sup>236</sup> and other related Alpine sites (fig. 29).<sup>237</sup>

This observation could be confirmed also by their dating. The bead from grave 67 from the necropolis of Limska Gradina was dated according to its context into the Ib phase of the Istrian culture, chronologically synchronized with the HaB1 phase. The same grave should be compared to grave 13 from the necropolis in Ljubljana, relating at least its initial phase of the relative Ljubljana Ib phase with the second half of the 11<sup>th</sup> and first half of 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>238</sup> The given well-dated finds of beads from the Italian and Alpine territory confirm the correctness of such dating.

By means of finds analysis the sites from Padania were singled out where the oldest production of such glass could be proved.<sup>239</sup> Thus, as direct imports, the II, IIIb bead types should be directly related to the so called "*Frattesina type*" beads,<sup>240</sup> i.e. with the artisan complex of the *Frattesina phenomenon*,<sup>241</sup> incorporating them into the already known circulation of goods on the territory of *Caput Adriae* and its Alpine hinterland stretching from its western to its eastern extent.<sup>242</sup> Alongside bone and amber beads, glass ones were mostly worn independently as amulets, and somewhat less frequently as necklaces in combination with beads of other materials and in more

new dating should acknowledge the correction of phases and sub phases of the Istrian chronology which are synchronized with the classical central-European periodization –the phases Istra Ia and Ib should be moved in to the 12<sup>th</sup> and in the 11<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>233</sup> Starè 1954: 30, T. XIV: 3.

<sup>234</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 35, T. 32: 10.

<sup>235</sup> Starac 1994: 22, P. XIII: 5.

<sup>236</sup> Salzani 1989: 28, Fig. 16: 5; Salzani 1992: 134, Fig. 29: 8; Towle et al. 2001: 12-13; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 78-79.

<sup>237</sup> Rychner-Faraggi 1993: 64-65, Fig. XII: 78; Rychner 1998: 292-293; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 81-82, Fig. 4-5; Bellintani 2011: Fig. 4: 2, 4, 5, 8-9, 15.

<sup>238</sup> Pare 1998: Tab. 4.

<sup>239</sup> The same goes also for other sites in the plains of rivers Po and Adige (Angelini et al. 2006). Chemical analysis of the so called north-Italian glass demonstrated Aegean and Levantine origin which was lately interpretatively articulated in to the process of trade and mediation linked to the Levantine and not Mycenaean dominance (Bietti Sestieri 2009: 33; Bellintani 2010: 143).

<sup>240</sup> Bellintani 2011: 275-277.

<sup>241</sup> Borgna 1992; Pearce 2000; Bellintani et al. 2006: 1518; Angelini et al. 2006; not exclusively from Frattesina sites.

<sup>242</sup> Blečić Kavrur 2012a; Blečić Kavrur 2012b.

vidno izdvajaju od ostalih mladih, poznatih primjera IIIb tipa, kao najsirođnije analogije u komparativnom gradivu stoje u odnosu također s nalazima iz frattesinskog kompleksa, posebno nekropole Narde (sl. 28)<sup>236</sup> te s njima povezanim drugim alpskim nalazištima (sl. 29).<sup>237</sup> S time u vezi podudara se i njihovo datiranje. Perla iz groba 67 limske nekropole smještena je temeljem konteksta u Ib fazu istarske kulture, vremenski sinkroniziranu s HaB1 stupnjem. Isti grob valja dovesti u izravniju kronološku vezu s grobom 13 iz ljubljanske nekropole, kako bi se barem i početni segment njegova relativnog stupnja Ljubljana Ib, kome i pripada, mogao vremenski apsolutno uskladiti s drugom polovinom 11. i prvom polovinom 10. stoljeća.<sup>238</sup> Navedeni, dobro datirani, nalazi takvih perli iz italjskog i alpskog prostora upravo potvrđuju ispravnost tako predložene datacije.

Analizom gradiva izdvojena su nalazišta s prostora padske nizine gdje je i dokazana najstarija proizvodnja takvoga stakla.<sup>239</sup> Stoga kao izravne importe, osobito perle varijanti II i IIIb tipa, valja povezati s tzv. perlama "tipa Frattesina",<sup>240</sup> tj. s obrtničkim kompleksom *Frattesina fenomena*,<sup>241</sup> uklapajući ih time u već poznato cirkuliranje dobara na prostoru *Caput Adriae* i alpskog zaleđa, od zapadnog pa sve do istočnog dijela pružanja.<sup>242</sup> A, budući da su staklene, pored koštanih i jantarnih perli najčešće nosile samostalno, kao amuleti, a nešto rjeđe kao ogrlice u kombinaciji s perlama drugih materijala i u složenijim nakitnim kompozicijama, krasile su nošnju ili nakitne garniture društveno istaknutijih pojedinaca raznih, ali međusobno povezanih kultura i kulturnih skupina. Svojim su primjerom kao indikatorom trgovine i razmjene još jednom potkrijepile veličinu, snagu i složenost te prostrane kulturne *koiné*,<sup>243</sup> kontinuirano od vremena HaA pa do HaB stupnjeva.<sup>244</sup>

Napokon, i u kategoriji sitnog nakita izričite simboličke vrijednosti izdvaja se nekoliko specifičnih primjera. U prvome redu, to su brončani prstenasti privjesci-obruči poznati iz grobova nekropole Limske gradine koji su, prema K. Mihovilić, vjerojatno bili ukrasnim dijelom torquesa.<sup>245</sup> Autorica im nalazi sigurne paralele i kronološki oslonac u nekropoli Dobove, kod već obrazlaganog groba 289, gdje su takvi privjesci bili nanizani na torquese rombičnog presjeka.<sup>246</sup> U njima vidi "vrlo rane utjecaje KPŽ na Istru", vrednujući pri tomu relativno visoku dataciju HaA1 stupnja.<sup>247</sup> Međutim,

sophisticated compositions of jewelry, they decorated the attire of socially exposed individuals, individuals of connected cultures and cultural groups - as indicators of trade and exchange, proving once again the extent, power and complexity of this wide cultural *koiné*,<sup>243</sup> on-going from the period of HaA until the HaB phase.<sup>244</sup>

Finally, also from the category of small jewelry with explicitly symbolic value a few specific examples can be singled out. First of all these include bronze ring-shaped pendants known from graves of Limska Gradina necropolis which were most probably, according to K. Mihovilić, the decoration of torques.<sup>245</sup> The author seeks for parallels and a chronological base in the already discussed grave 289 of the necropolis in Dobova where bronze ring-shaped pendants were arranged on torques with a rhomboid cross-section,<sup>246</sup> and in which she can see the "very early influences of the Urnfield culture on Istria", evaluating at the same time relatively high dating of the HaA1 phase.<sup>247</sup> However, the same fashion is preserved in the hoard Kanalski vrh 1<sup>248</sup> and known from the rich grave number 7 from the necropolis in Ormož, where such pendants were dated with a large spectacle fibula with a central little loop in to the phase HaB.<sup>249</sup>

<sup>243</sup> Comp. Teržan 2007.

<sup>244</sup> Comp. Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2014.

<sup>245</sup> They were discovered mostly isolated in the graves, but in graves 57, 59 and 60 they could be linked to the necklaces (Mihovilić 1972: 45-46, T. 5: 8-11; T. 8: 15-18; T. 26: 6-7, 25; T. 29: 10; T. 30: 8).

<sup>246</sup> Starè 1975: T. 41: 4-5.

<sup>247</sup> The representative grave number 289 from Dobova was several times interpreted in the scientific literature. Especially necklaces with ring-shaped pendants were the interest of K. Vinski-Gasparini (1973: 117, f.n. 892) which draw the attention to the grave number 1 from the necropolis in Grünwald in Bavaria dated in to HaA1, creating the main argument for an old dating of the grave and the consequent characterization of the I. phase of burials on the necropolis of Dobova – an argument later used by J. Dular (1978: 37, 41). It is interesting that also a green glass bead with gray treads was discovered in the grave, which is actually a rare find on the necropolis (Teržan 1999: Fig. 10-11) and suggest, as we have seen, younger date in to the HaA2/B1 phase. An even younger dating was proposed by S. Hansen who, analyzing the pottery, necklaces with ring-shaped pendants and semilunate pendants in the region, comparing them with the finds from the western part of Central Europe, dated it in to HaB1 (Hansen 1994: 242). The same position was proposed also by Balerdelli et al. (1990: 193-195) dating it in to the II. phase of the necropolis synchronized with phase HaB1. Comp. Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001: 157-158, Sl. 13.

<sup>248</sup> Žbona Trkman, Bavdek 1996: 62, T. 97, 98: 12.

<sup>249</sup> Tomanič-Jevremov 1988: T. 13; Tomanič-Jevremov 1989: 282, 290, T. 17: 5. For the results of metallographic analysis and distribution of necklaces with ring-shaped pendants see N. Trampuž Orel and D. J. Heath (2001: 155-158, Sl. 13). But from their discussion the examples from Ormož and Grünwald, as well as the not so distant grave 213 from Kelheim (Müller-Karpe 1952: 46, T. 25F: 7) and grave 28 from Überacker (Erbach 1995: 308-310, Abb 3) were omitted as well as the Istrian examples which were not included in to their analysis (fig. 30). It is not clear whether were analyzed and weighted only the necklaces or their rings which would be actually a contribution to the claim about the jewelry (?) or the claim about the value and the transfer of individual weights with a high proportion of tin, which was demonstrated for the ring-shaped pendants by P. Turk (2001: 276-278). The author introduced and described in detail not only the weights and their different but complementary systems, and demonstrates the importance of weighing the finished artifacts. In favor of this argument are also the finds from Picenum where several larger soldered rings of rhomboidal cross section were discovered on which numerous small decorative rings with the same weight were added! It is considered that they were used as funds or as weights for weighting. The only example from a closed context comes from the grave Macerata Rotacupa dated in to the II<sup>nd</sup> phase of the Piceni culture (Dall'Osso 1915: 123; Lollini 1976: 125-129, Fig. 4: 3; Teržan 1995: 339, f.n. 46; Baldelli 1999: 275, cat. 600). Other examples come from Porto S. Elpidio (Baldelli 1999: 275, cat. 601), S. Ginesio (Dall'Osso 1915: 115), and Tore S. Patrizio and from a collection in Fermo – mostly from sites between the river Potenza and Valle del Tenna, while the origin of the ring from Numana is uncertain (Baldelli 1999: 275). On

<sup>236</sup> Salzani 1989: 28, Fig. 16: 5; Salzani 1992: 134, Fig. 29: 8; Towle et al. 2001: 12-13; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 78-79.

<sup>237</sup> Rychner-Faraggi 1993: 64-65, Fig. XII: 78; Rychner 1998: 292-293; Bellintani, Stefan 2009: 81-82, Fig. 4-5; Bellintani 2011: Fig. 4: 2, 4, 5, 8-9, 15.

<sup>238</sup> Pare 1998: Tab. 4.

<sup>239</sup> To se odnosi i na druga nalazišta uz nizinu rijeka Po i Adige; Angelini et al. 2006; Perlama s prostora Egeje i Levanta kemijskim je analizama potvrđeno podrijetlo tzv. sjevernoitalskog stakla, koje se u novije vrijeme interpretativno artikulira u trgovačko-posredničkom procesu uže povezanog uz levantsku dominaciju, ne više uz mikensku (Bietti Sestieri 2009: 33; Bellintani 2010: 143). Bellintani 2011: 275-277.

<sup>240</sup> Borgna 1992; Pearce 2000; Bellintani et al. 2006: 1518; Angelini et al. 2006; ne isključivo frattesinskih nalazišta.

<sup>241</sup> Blečić Kavur 2012a; Blečić Kavur 2012b.

<sup>242</sup> Usp. Teržan 2007.

<sup>243</sup> Usp. Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2014.

<sup>244</sup> Najčešće su samostalno dokumentirani u grobovima, a u bližu vezu s torquesima mogu se dovesti u grobovima 57, 59 i 60 (Mihovilić 1972: 45-46, T. 5: 8-11; T. 8: 15-18; T. 26: 6-7, 25; T. 29: 10; T. 30: 8).

<sup>245</sup> Starè 1975: T. 41: 4-5.

<sup>246</sup> Reprezentativni grob 289 iz Dobove bio je u više pokušaja interpretiran u stručnoj literaturi. Posebno glede na ogrlice s obručastim privjescima njime se bavila K. Vinski-Gasparini (1973: 117, f.n. 892), nalazeći im paralelu u grobu 1 nekropole Grünwald u Bavarskoj, datiranog u HaA1 stupanj. Isto je bez dvojbi, i kao ključni argument za visoku dataciju toga groba, tj. obilježavanje I. faze pokopavanja na dobovskoj nekropoli, preuzeo J. Dular (1978: 37, 41). Za-

ista je neokrnjena moda "pohranjena" i u ostavi Kanalski Vrh 1,<sup>248</sup> a poznata je i iz bogatog groba 7 iz nekropole u Ormožu gdje su isti privjesci datirani uz veliku naočalastu fibulu s malom osmicom u HaB stupanj.<sup>249</sup> S obzirom na navedene druge paralele iz istočnoalpskog prostora razvidno je da ogrlice s obručastim privjescima nisu kronološki fiksirane nego se pojavljuju kroz dulji vremenski raspon i da grob 289 iz Dobove ne može biti kronološkim uporištem za dataciju I. faze pokopavanja na istoimenoj nekropoli u sinkronizirani HaA1 stupanj kako je to nekada smatrao J. Dular.<sup>250</sup> Navedena je kronološka pozicija u relativnom poimanju već temeljito i analitično, s različitim aspektata prokomentirana u literaturi, poglavito *pro et contra* argumentima B. Teržan i S. Hansena,<sup>251</sup> s čime bi valjalo odgovarajuće raspolagati pri razumijevanju tzv. "ranih" utjecaja KPŽ na Istru (sl. 31).

Međutim, kao dio kompleta ženske nošnje obručasti su privjesci zabilježeni u Osoru (kat. 92) i u "rekonstruiranom grobu" iz Baške, pa su vjerojatno pored ogrlica od jantarnih i koštanih perli bili dio nakitne prsne garniture više ogrlica ili možda pojasa (kat. 13, sl. 20). Ako je tomu tako, s obzirom na približno poznate okolnosti nalaza te smještaj tih privjesaka u širem kulturnom i vremenskom kontekstu, i kvarnerski bi se privjesci mogli povezati uz utjecaje iz zaleđa, tj. iz kulturnog kompleksa KPŽ, vjerojatno dobovske, ili čak iz obližnje japodske skupine, gdje je upravo i karakteristična žen-

nimljivo je i to, da se u grobu našla i zelena staklena perla sa sivim nitima, što je zapravo rjeđa pojava na toj nekropoli (Teržan 1999: Fig. 10-11), i nagovara na, kako smo vidjeli, nižu dataciju HaA2/B1 stupnja. Još nižu poziciju predlaže i S. Hansen, analizirajući usporedbe keramičkog gradiva u regiji, uspoređujući ogrlice s obručastim privjescima i polumjesečaste privjeske s nalazima iz zapadnog dijela srednje Europe (Hansen 1994: 242), odnosno smješta ga u HaB1 stupanj. Isti stav imali su i Balerdelli et al. (1990: 193-195) smještajući grob u II. fazu nekropole sukladnoj s HaB1 stupnjem. Usp. Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001: 157-158, Sl. 13.

<sup>248</sup> Žbona Trkman, Bavdek 1996: 62, T. 97, 98: 12.

<sup>249</sup> Tomanič-Jevremov 1988: T. 13; Tomanič-Jevremov 1989: 282, 290, T. 17: 5. Za rezultate metalurških analiza i rasprostranjenost ogrlica s obručastim privjescima vidjeti kod N. Trampuž Orel i D. J. Heath (2001: 155-158, Sl. 7; Sl. 13). Ipak, iz njihova izlaganja izostavljen je primjerak ogrlice iz Ormoža i iz Grünwalda, ali i iz ne tako udaljenog groba 213 iz Kelheima (Müller-Karpe 1952: 46, T. 25F: 7) i iz groba 28 iz Überackerna (Erbach 1995: 308-310, Abb 3: 5), ako istarski primjerci iz nekog razloga nisu ubrajani u njihove analize (sl. 30). S obzirom na gustoću nalaženja na području sjevernog Jadrana i njegova jugoistočnoalpskog zaleđa, teza o eventualnoj stranoj radionici takvog tipa ogrlica neće biti održiva, jer se situacija pokazuje, naime, sve više u njihovom razumijevanju unutar transalpske *koinè* toga vremena. Također, nije jasno jesu li analizirane (i vagane) samo ogrlice ili i njihovi obruči, što bi zapravo bio prilog ili tezi o nakitu (?) ili tezi o vrijednostima i prijenosima pojedinih težina s velikim postotkom kositra, što je za kolutaste privjeske i perle argumentirano pokazao P. Turk (2001: 276-278). Autor iscrpno uvodi i opisuje vrijednost ne samo težina i njihovih različitih, ali komplementarnih sistema, već ukazuje i na vrijednost vaganja posebno gotovih predmeta. U prilog pak toj tezi svjedoče i nalazi iz Picenuma, gdje je poznato nekoliko primjeraka većih lemljenih obruča rombičnog presjeka s pridodanim brojnim malim ukrasnim obručima svih istih težina! Smatra se da su služili upravo kao platežno sredstvo ili kao utezi za vaganje. Jedini primjerak koji potječe iz zatvorene sredine je obruč iz groba Macerata Rotacupa datiran u II. fazu kulture Picena (Dall'Osso 1915: 123; Lollini 1976: 125-129, Fig. 4: 3; Teržan 1995: 339, f.n. 46; Baldelli 1999: 275, kat. 600). Ostali primjerci potječu iz Porto S. Elpidio (Baldelli 1999: 275, kat. 601), S. Ginesio (Dall'Osso 1915: 115), Tore S. Patrizio i iz zbirke u Fermu, dakle, najvećim brojem između rijeke Potenza i Valle del Tenna, dok je primjerak istog obruča iz Numane nesigurnog podrijetla (Baldelli 1999: 275). Promatrajući iz drugog smjera, obručasti privjesci potječu i iz ostava II, III, IV i V iz Celldömölka-Saghegy, od toga su u ostavama II i V zatupljeni s koštanim perlicama. Smatrani njegovom posebnosti, vremenski su također smješteni u horizont Romand, sinkronim s HaB1-B2 horizontom (Mozsolics 2000: 25-26, 37-39, T. 19: 10; T. 122: 1; T. 125: 11-14; T. 126: 12) (sl. 31).

<sup>250</sup> Dular 1978: 37, Abb. 1.

<sup>251</sup> Teržan 1995: 339, f.n. 45-47; Hansen 1994: 242, Abb. 156.

Taking into consideration parallels from the East Alpine area it is obvious that necklaces with such ring-shaped pendants are not chronologically sensitive and appear in a longer span of time. Consequently grave 289 from Dobova cannot be an adequate chronological base for the dating of the I. phase of the burials on the site into HaA as proposed by J. Dular.<sup>250</sup> The doubts about the dating were thoroughly and analytically from different aspects *pro et contra* argued by B. Teržan and S. Hansen<sup>251</sup> – positions which should be considered in the explanation of the so called "early" Urnfield culture influences on Istria as supposed by K. Mihovilić (fig. 31).

But as a part of female attire such ring-shaped pendants were documented in Osor (cat. 92) and in the "grave" from Baška, and were, along with the necklaces with amber and bone beads, a part of the set of several necklaces (cat. 13, fig. 20). If so, taking into consideration the known circumstances of discovery and placing these ring-shaped pendants into a broader cultural and chronological context, also the rings from Baška could be linked to the influences deriving from the east Alpine area of the Urnfield culture, most probably the Dobova group, or even from the nearby Japodian group, where they present a standard female attire and the habit of adding several (odd) necklaces is well documented.<sup>252</sup> According to the realistically and rationalistically determined chronological circumstances they should be dated in a chronological horizon dated from HaA2 to HaB1-B2. However, beside the fact that these pendants did not appear before the Late Bronze Age<sup>253</sup>, they remained on the vast territory of different European cultures in use for a longer period all the way to the Early Iron Age – as we can see in the hoard from Trtėnov or the graves from the Bologna necropolis of S. Vitale, which were dated into the 9<sup>th</sup> century of HaB3 period (fig. 31).<sup>254</sup> Therefore, it does not stand out quite accidentally and their discovery in the grave 4 from the necropolis in Nin, where they were part of a rich assemblage of female jewelry and attire dated also in to the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>255</sup> Moreover, the pendants from Osor (cat. 92) present the morphological characteristics of these younger pendants with a rhomboid cross-section. Altogether they were attributed different roles – being a decoration but also being a valuable object included into the specific long distance transfers, roles which could be accepted also for our pendants from Baška and Osor.<sup>256</sup>

Also the fragment of a disc shaped pendant from Osor (cat. 93) fits into this issue and is considered within this context. It is a smaller fragment made of bronze where the traces of the inner and outer circle and two connecting roads with distinctively cast edges can be seen. Due to its fragmentation, the inclusion into a specific type<sup>257</sup> is made impossible. Despite that and the fact that it has been present in the scientific literature for a long time<sup>258</sup> it was never included into a single important analysis of pendants.<sup>259</sup> With its preserved mor-

the other side, ring-shaped pendants are known from hoards II, III, IV and V from Celldömölka-Saghegy. In the hoards II and V were discovered also bone beads. Considered being its specialty, they were chronologically dated in to the Romand horizon, synchronized with the HaB1-B2 horizon (Mozsolics 2000: 25-26, 37-39, T. 19: 10; T. 122: 1; T. 125: 11-14; T. 126: 12) (fig. 31).

<sup>250</sup> Dular 1978: 37, Abb. 1.

<sup>251</sup> Teržan 1995: 339, f.n. 45-47; Hansen 1994: 242, Abb. 156.

<sup>252</sup> Teržan 1995: 340, Abb. 12-13; Teržan 1999: 119, 139, Fig. 11; Ložnjak Dizdar 2009: 161, K. 1.

<sup>253</sup> Primas 2011: 128.

<sup>254</sup> Primas 2001: 129.


<sup>255</sup> Batović 1981: 147, Sl. 4: 20; Hiller 1991: 356-357, T. 4: 46-47; T. 5.

<sup>256</sup> Primas 2011: 128-129.

<sup>257</sup> For example Turk 2001: 260-261, Fig. 6.

<sup>258</sup> Glogović 1982: Sl. 3: 6.

<sup>259</sup> Due to the large interval between the crossbars the disc shaped pendant



**Slika 31.** Karta prostorne distribucije torquesa s obručastim privjescima i obručastih privjesaka na prostoru Alpa i jadranskog bazena starije (●) i mlađe (▲) varijante (nadopunjeno prema Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001, Primas 2011) (Lista 3).

**Figure 31.** Distribution map of torques with ring-shaped pendants and ring-shaped pendants on the territory of the Alps and the Adriatic basin; older (●) and younger (▲) variant (supplemented after Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001; Primas 2011) (List 3).

ska nošnja, odnosno običaj prilaganja u grob više (neparnih) ogrlica.<sup>252</sup> Shodno realno određenim vremenskim okolnostima mogu se šire datirati, u raspon od HaA2 do HaB1-B2 stupnja. No unatoč činjenici da se opisani privjesci ne pojavljuju prije kasnog brončanog doba,<sup>253</sup> u uporabi su se zadržali znatno dulje vremena, sve do starijeg željeznog doba, također na prostranom području raznorodnih europskih kultura, pr. poput onih u ostavi iz Trténov ili onih iz grobova bolognske nekropole S. Vitale, koji zapravo svi imaju istovremenu dataciju 9. stoljeća HaB3 (sl. 31).<sup>254</sup> Slučajnošću se zato ne izdvaja niti nalaz istih iz groba 4 nekropole u Ninu, gdje su nađene u ansamblu bogatog ženskog nakita i nošnje, datiranih također u 9. stoljeće,<sup>255</sup> a toj mlađoj varijanti, rombičnog presjeka obruča, moći će se pripisati i privjesci iz Osora (kat. 92). Sve zajedno, pripisana im višenamjenska uloga, i kao ukrasa i kao vrijednosti u prijenosima određenih razmjena na velikim udaljenostima, valja biti odgovarajuće prihvaćena i za naše privjeske iz Baške i Osora.<sup>256</sup>

Na cjelokupnu se problematiku lijepo nadovezuje, a u tom kontekstu i razmatra, ulomak brončanog kolutastog privjeska iz Osora (kat. 93). Riječ je o doista manjem ulomku od bronce kojemu su vidljivi vanjski i unutarnji krug te dvije prečke, s prepoznatljivim lijevanim rubovima. Zbog toga je, nažalost, njegova podređenost nekoj od klasifikacija poznatih tipologija<sup>257</sup> onemogućena. No i unatoč tomu, te duljem postojanju u literaturi,<sup>258</sup> nije nikada bio

phology it demonstrates the closest resemblance to the examples from the depots of Mušja jama near Škocjan and the above mentioned Kanalski vrh I.<sup>260</sup> However, the surface of the Osor find does not suggest a certain shine – the possibility of a large proportion of tin which was demonstrated for the examples from Kanalski vrh. Since such pendants appear through a longer period of time their exact chronological position is hard to determine, but in every case they are to be attributed to the period of the Late Bronze Age when they, besides in hoards, make their most numerous appearances in graves.<sup>261</sup> If we observe their spatial distribution they appear on the same area like necklaces with ring-shaped pendants.<sup>262</sup> It seems that the ring-shaped pendants were a characteristic of female graves belonging to individuals which, at least according to the examples from Sveta Lucija cultural circle, should have had an important, if not exceptional status in society.<sup>263</sup>

The find from Osor definitely ameliorates the knowledge about the area of Kvarner and *Caput Adriae* and puts them into relation with the contexts in the area of Frattesina and further on with the area of the Tyrrhenian *Etruria mineraria*,<sup>264</sup> on one side, and across the area of Škocjan with the east Alpine area, on the other side. Although information concerning the discovery of find is unfortunately inac-

<sup>252</sup> Teržan 1995: 340, Abb. 12-13; Teržan 1999: 119, 139, Fig. 11; Ložnjak Dizdar 2009: 161, K. 1.

<sup>253</sup> Primas 2011: 128.

<sup>254</sup> Primas 2001: 129.

<sup>255</sup> Batović 1981: 147, Sl. 4: 20; Hiller 1991: 356-357, T. 4: 46-47; T. 5.

<sup>256</sup> Primas 2011: 128-129.

<sup>257</sup> Npr. Turk 2001: 260-261, Fig. 6.

<sup>258</sup> Glogović 1982: Sl. 3: 6.

from Osor could most probably belong to the 3rd group with 4 crossbars according to P. Turk (2001: Fig. 3: 1; Fig. 6: G. 3). D. Glogović does not comment it or analyze it in the listed treatise.

<sup>260</sup> Žbona-Trkman, Bavdek 1996: T. 100; 101; 102; 103: 58; Turk 2001: 258-259; Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001: 144-150.

<sup>261</sup> Žbona-Trkman, Bavdek 1996: 63.


<sup>262</sup> Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001: 155-157, Sl. 13.

<sup>263</sup> Turk 2001: 258.

<sup>264</sup> Similar pendants from southern Calabria were considered by M. Pacciarelli as one of the leading elements of the *Nicotera* horizon or the end of the PF 1 and the beginning of the PF 2 of Calabria (Pacciarelli 2001: 48-50, Fig. 27: 16).

uvršten u neke od poznatih analiza o navedenim privjescima.<sup>259</sup> Svojim karakteristikama podsjeća svakako na najbliže i najrodnije primjerke iz ostave Mušja jama kod Škocjana i iz spomenute ostave Kanalski Vrh I.<sup>260</sup> Ipak, površina osorskog privjeska ne sugerira određen sjaj, tj. mogućnost postojanja veće količine kositra, što je dokazano za primjerke iz Kanalskega Vrha. Budući da se takvi privjesci javljaju kroz dulje vremensko razdoblje njihova je preciznija kronološka odredljivost otežana, ali svakako su svojstveni vremenu kasnog brončanog doba kada se, osim u ostavama, poglavito javljaju i u grobovima.<sup>261</sup> Kako pokazuje karta njihove prostorne raširenosti podudaraju se s rasprostiranjem ogrlica s obručastim privjescima<sup>262</sup> pa nije slučajno što su i kolutasti (sunčevi) privjesci zapravo obilježje isključivo grobova ženskih pokojnica koje su, barem prema primjerima iz svetolucijskog kulturnog kruga, morale imati značajniji, zapravo izniman status unutar svoje društvene zajednice.<sup>263</sup> Nalaz iz Osora svakako upotpunjuje spoznaje za prostor Kvarnera i *Caput Adriae*, odnosno njihove međusobne povezanosti i u kontekstima s prostorom Frattesine, a preko nje s područjem tirenske *Etrurie minerarie*,<sup>264</sup> i s druge strane preko škocjanskog područja s istočnoalpskim krugom. Sva su nam ostala znanja glede toga primjerka, nažalost, nedostupna. Ipak, vjerojatno je i taj kolutasti (sunčev) privjesak sudjelovao ravnopravno u prenošenju određenih informacija, možda o težinama i/ili o kemijskom sastavu kako je pokazao za ostale relevantne primjerke P. Turk.<sup>265</sup> U ikonografskom je pak repertoaru kultura kasnog brončanog doba još od sinteze G. Kossacka konvencionalno povezivan uz solarnu simboliku interpretacije svijeta. No stupanj njegova simboličkog razumijevanja morao je biti znatno viši. Ali, ne samo za predmet poradi predmeta, već i za osobe, u ovom slučaju žene, najvjerojatnije svećenice, koje su obavljale pojedine procese vezane uz ritualne ili druge prakse, kako je to na primjeru Kanalskega Vrha uvjerljivo zaključio isti autor.<sup>266</sup>

Bogatstvom ili znamenjem istaknuti grobovi žena izgleda da nekako obilježavaju pokopavanje na dobovskoj nekropoli. Osim kolutastih (sunčevih) privjesaka, brončani obručasti privjesci bili su, pored ostalog inventara, zabilježeni u grobu H (sl. 32). Taj je grob istaknut i po tome što se ondje nalazio brončani antropomorfnu privjesak,<sup>267</sup> kakav je također poznat i iz groba 17, a jedan i kao sporadičan nalaz (sl. 33),<sup>268</sup> Trapezasti, tj. antropomorfnu privjesci, uz astralne i ornitomorfne, s podrijetlom u srednjem brončanom dobu, obilježavaju jedan od vodećih simbola ikonografskog sustava kasnobrončanodobnog vremena u čijem se središtu nalazio čovjek.<sup>269</sup> Morfološki je moguće da predstavljaju i neku izvedenicu od privjesaka oblika "pješčanog sata" koji se izvorno nije smatrao antropomorfnim, ali je to u evoluciji privjeska nedvojbeno postao.<sup>270</sup> Izuzev u Dobovi podobni se, iako ne isti,



Slika 32. Grobna cijelina »H« iz Dobove (prema Starè 1975).

Figure 32. Grave ensemble »H« from Dobova (after Starè 1975).

cessible, it was most probably also an active member in the transfer of information, perhaps on its weight or its chemical composition as demonstrated by P. Turk.<sup>265</sup> In the iconographical context its form was, ever since the synthesis by G. Kossack, linked to the solar symbolic of interpretation of the world. The level of symbolic comprehension of the artifact could be even higher, most probably for the persons, in this case most probably women, priestesses that performed individual processes linked to the rituals or other practices, as supposed by the author in the case of Kanalski vrh.<sup>266</sup>

Rich or symbolic grave goods also designate several female burials on the necropolis of Dobova. Beside the disc pendants, bronze ring pendants were among other finds discovered in the grave H (fig. 32). The latter is special due to the presence of a bronze anthropomorphic pendant,<sup>267</sup> similar to the example from the grave 17 and to a sporadic find from the same necropolis (fig. 33).<sup>268</sup> Trapezoid, or so called anthropomorphic pendants, along with astral and ornitomorphic, derived from the formal world of the Middle Bronze Age, designate one of the leading symbols of the iconographic system of the Bronze Age focused on the human bodily form.<sup>269</sup> It is possible that they morphologically represent a derived form of the "sand glass" formed pendants which were originally not considered to be anthropomorphic, but consequently became so.<sup>270</sup> Beside Dobova similar, if not identical, pendants were discovered in Pobrežje, Ruše and Maribor (fig. 33; 34).<sup>271</sup> An almost identical pendant is also known from Picugi – though the latter is unfortunately just a stray find (fig. 33).<sup>272</sup> Those pendants have often been compared to a big-

<sup>259</sup> S obzirom na veliki razmak između prečki osorski bi kolutasti privjesak najvjerojatnije pripadao skupini 3 s četiri prečke prema P. Turku (2001: Fig. 3: 1; Fig. 6: G. 3). D. Glogović privjesak u navedenom djelu ne analizira niti interpretira.

<sup>260</sup> Žbona-Trkman, Bavdek 1996: T. 100; 101; 102; 103: 58; Turk 2001: 258-259; Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001: 144-150.

<sup>261</sup> Žbona-Trkman, Bavdek 1996: 63.

<sup>262</sup> Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001: 155-157, Sl. 13.

<sup>263</sup> Turk 2001: 258.

<sup>264</sup> Vrlo slične privjeske iz južne Kalabrije M. Pacciarelli smatra vodećim tipom horizonta *Nicotera*, odnosno kraja PF1 i početnog PF2 Kalabrije (Pacciarelli 2001: 48-50, Fig. 27: 16).

<sup>265</sup> Turk 2001: 263-265; vidjeti f.n. 247.

<sup>266</sup> Turk 2001: 267.

<sup>267</sup> Starè 1975: T. 3: 3.

<sup>268</sup> Starè 1951: 65, Ris. 6, Sl. 1; Starè 1975: T. 8: 17/9, T. 1: 1.

<sup>269</sup> Teržan 1987b: 77-78, Sl. 57; Teržan 1999: 139, Fig. 11.

<sup>270</sup> Kukoč 1995: 66-67, Sl. 6: 4-6, 9-10, Sl. 7: 8-9; usp. Hansen 1994: 245.

<sup>265</sup> Turk 2001: 263-265. See f.n. 247.

<sup>266</sup> Turk 2001: 267.

<sup>267</sup> Starè 1975: T. 3: 3.


<sup>268</sup> Starè 1951: 65, Ris. 6, Sl. 1; Starè 1975: T. 8: 17/9, T. 1: 1.

<sup>269</sup> Teržan 1987b: 77-78, Sl. 57; Teržan 1999: 139, Fig. 11.

<sup>270</sup> Kukoč 1995: 66-67, Sl. 6: 4-6, 9-10, Sl. 7: 8-9; comp. Hansen 1994: 245.

<sup>271</sup> Pahič 1972: T. 27; Kaerner 1989: Abb. 7: 3, 5; Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 118: 25.

<sup>272</sup> Mladin 1980: 176, 190, Sl. 2: 9; Mihovilić 1987: T. 1: 1; comp. Batović 1987b: T. XII: 22; The author lists this pendant among the basic forms of the II<sup>nd</sup> Istrian phase comparing it with a similar, even identical pendants as those from Dobova, but thinks they are younger and dates them in to the 6<sup>th</sup> century (Batović 1987b: 14). K. Mihovilić dated them initially to the HaA1 phase (Mihovilić 1987: 43) and later to HaA2 (Mihovilić 2013: 142, Sl. 82)! In a recent reflection of similar sand glass or shield-shaped pendants dated from the HaB of the Pannonian Urnfield culture, only several of here mentioned pen-



**Slika 33.** Trapezasti-antropomorfnu privjesci: 1-4 Pobrežje (prema Kaerner 1989), 5 Maribor (prema Müller-Karpe 1959), 6-8 Ruše (prema Kaerner 1989); 9-11 Dobova (prema Starè 1975); 12 Picugi (prema Mihovilić 1987), 13-14 Krk (Baška) (prema Batović 2003), 15-16 Veliki Mošunj (prema Harding 1995, König 2004a).

**Figure 33.** Trapezoid-anthropomorphic pendants: 1-4 Pobrežje (after Kaerner 1989), 5 Maribor (after Müller-Karpe 1959), 6-8 Ruše (after Kaerner 1989); 9-11 Dobova (after Starè 1975); 12 Picugi (after Mihovilić 1987), 13-14 Krk (Baška) (after Batović 2003), 15-16 Veliki Mošunj (after Harding 1995; König 2004a).

privjesci nalaze u Pobrežju, Rušama i u Mariboru (sl. 33; 34).<sup>271</sup> No gotovo identični trapezasto-antropomorfnu privjesak dobovskima poznat je iz Picuga kao pojedinačni nalaz (sl. 33).<sup>272</sup> S navedenima je često uspoređivan veći, stiliziran i geometrijski ukrašen privjesak iz ostave Veliki Mošunj,<sup>273</sup> iako se ondje nalazi još šest istih neukrašenih privjesaka (sl. 33).<sup>274</sup> Njima se sada može pridružiti i grupa od četiri privjeska iz otoka Krka (kat. 18, sl. 21; 33),<sup>275</sup> od kojih jedan na tijelu ima ukras urezanih koncentričnih kružnica koje su međusobno spojene trostruko urezanim tangencijalnom linijom. Po svojoj formi najbliži su privjescima iz Velikog Mošunja, ali u osnovi onima iz Dobove i Picuga. Zbog načina izvedbe ukrasa kao i stilske dinamike srodni su pak ukrasu na "štitu" iz Velikog Mošunja kojeg B. Čović smatra vodećim motivom II. faze zapadno-balkanskog geometrijskog stila, odnosno apstraktnog geometrizma u likovnom izrazu kasnog brončanog doba.<sup>276</sup>

Prikazani se trapezasto-antropomorfnu privjesci iz Krka dovode u priskupnu vezu s dobovskom skupinom, gdje se evidentno nalazilo i neko njihovo ideološko i stilsko ishodište razvoja i rasprostiranja (sl. 34). U formalnom smislu razlikuju se u četiri osnovna tipa (I-IV) (sl. 33-34) kojima se, s obzirom na ukras, mogu dalje eventualno izdvajati inačice, ne nužno kronoloških vrijednosti. Vremenski se zato usmjeravaju k odnosu unutar stupnja HaA2/B1, tj. HaB1 što su

ger, more stylized and geometrically decorated pendant of the Veliki Mošunj hoard,<sup>273</sup> although other 6 same but undecorated pendants were found (fig. 33).<sup>274</sup> We could add to the latter a group of four pendants from the island of Krk, precisely from the destroyed graves from Baška (cat. 18, fig. 21; 33).<sup>275</sup> Only a single example is decorated with incised circles which are mutually connected with a triple incised line. Regarding their form, they are most similar to the examples from Veliki Mošunj and to a certain degree also to the finds from Dobova and Picugi. The implementation of the decoration as well as the stylistic dynamics could be considered similar to the "shield" from Veliki Mošunj, the find which was designated by B. Čović as one of the leading motives of the II<sup>nd</sup> phase of the west Balkan geometric style or, precisely, the abstract geometrism in the visual expression of the Late Bronze Age.<sup>276</sup>

The presented trapezoidal-anthropomorphic pendants from Krk should be considered in a closer connection to the Dobova group of the Urnfield culture, where their stylistic and ideological starting point of development and distribution (fig. 34) was evidently located. In a formal sense four basic types (I – IV) can be differentiated (fig. 33-34) which could be, according to their decoration, further subdivided into not necessarily chronologically different variants. Generally, they could be dated into the framework of the HaA2/B1, this is B1 phase which was already well argued,<sup>277</sup> and which should be considered also a chronological reference for the northern Adriatic pendants. Being considered as metaphors with precisely defined positions in the non-verbal communication system within the south-eastern Alpine cultural and creative environment, they were attributed an important meaning – a fact that should be kept

<sup>271</sup> Pahić 1972: T. 27; Kaerner 1989: Abb. 7: 3, 5; Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 118: 25.

<sup>272</sup> Mladin 1980: 176, 190, Sl. 2: 9; Mihovilić 1987: T. I: 1; usp. Batović 1987b: T. XII: 22; Autor svrstava privjesak u temeljne oblike istarske III. faze, uspoređujući ga sa sličnim, pa čak i istim privjescima kao što su oni iz Dobove, ali smatra da su znatno mlađi smještajući ih prenisoko, u 6. stoljeće (Batović 1987b: 14). K. Mihovilić ih datira najprije prema HaA1 (Mihovilić 1987: 43), a potom prema HaA2 stupnju (Mihovilić 2013: 142, Sl. 82). U nedavnom osvrtu na srodne privjeske oblika pješčanog sata ili u obliku štita iz horizonta HaB panonske KPŽ, samo su neki od ovdje obrađenih privjesaka odabrani za analizu, pri čemu su izdvojeni u tzv. "lokalnoj varijanti" antropomorfnih privjesaka (Ložnjak Dizdar 2009: 164-165, K. 2).

<sup>273</sup> Čović 1984: 15; Harding 1995: T. 65: 1, 5, 10.

<sup>274</sup> Usp. recentniji sintetski rad König 2004b: 127-137.

<sup>275</sup> Batović 2003: Sl. 15: 1-2, 18: 1-4.

<sup>276</sup> Čović 1984: 15, 33.

dants were discussed. They were included in to the so called "local variant" of anthropomorphic pendants (Ložnjak Dizdar 2009: 164-165, K. 2).


<sup>273</sup> Čović 1984: 15; Harding 1995: T. 65: 1, 5, 10.

<sup>274</sup> Comp. a recent synthetically studies by P. König 2004b: 127-137.

<sup>275</sup> Batović 2003: Sl. 15: 1-2, 18: 1-4.

<sup>276</sup> Čović 1984: 15, 33.

<sup>277</sup> Belardelli et al. 1990: 193-194, T. 82: 8; Teržan 1995: 339, f.n. 45.



**Slika 34.** Karta rasprostranjenosti trapezastih-antropomorfnih privjesaka kao na slici 33: tip I (●), tip II (■), tip III (▲), tip IV (◆) (Lista 4).

**Figure 34.** Distribution map of the trapezoid-anthropomorphic pendants as it is shown on figure 33: type I (●), type II (■), type III (▲), type IV (◆) (List 4).

već bile argumentirano postavljene teze,<sup>277</sup> i u toj se povezanosti razumijevaju i sjevernojadranski privjesci. Nadalje, kao metaforama točno određene pozicije u neverbalnom komunikacijskom sustavu s jugoistočnoalpskim kulturno-stvaralačkim miljeom, pridaje im se iznimno značenje, zbog čega se valja prisjetiti upravo identično izrađenog ukrasa našem krčkom primjerku. On je naime izveden na polumjesečastim britvama tipa Oblekovice, ispred svega na britvi iz Ljubljane, grob 11,<sup>278</sup> koja je, povrh svega upravo i datirana u isto vrijeme.<sup>279</sup>

Međutim, pored tako osobnih dijelova nošnje i nakita, u kategoriju luksuznih ili posebno vrijednih predmeta ubrajaju se i dijelovi vojne opreme, između koje je poseban status pripisan maču. S primjerima mačeva jezičastog rukohvata povezanost s egejsko-grčkim prostorom kasnomikenskog i submikenskoga vremena već je uspostavljena za prostor sjevernojadranskog područja, temeljem nalaza iz dobro poznatih konteksta u padskoj nizini, okolice Frattesine pa sve do Gazzo Veronese.<sup>280</sup> Riječ je o mačevima definiranim tipom Alleronona za prostor Apeninskog poluotoka, izjednačenim sa skupinom Naue II tipa C prema I. Kilian Dirlmeier za prostor Egeje (sl. 35).<sup>281</sup>

<sup>277</sup> Belardelli et al. 1990: 193-194, T. 82: 8; Teržan 1995: 339, f.n. 45.

<sup>278</sup> Starè 1954: T. XII: 2.

<sup>279</sup> Weber 1996: 237-238, T. 50: 556; T. 65.

<sup>280</sup> Salzani 1989: 34-38; Salzani 2002a: 159, Fig. 1: 1; Eder, Jung 2005: 490, Pl. CVIII. Mač jezičastog rukohvata iz Škocjana B. Teržan (1984: 111) pripisuje tipu Alleronona, tj. tipu Catling II/III s čime s složio i P. Turk (1994: 123, T. 15: 2), koji ga datira kao jednog od najstarijih elemenata ostave u Mušjoj jami, tj. u njegov II. horizont. Drugačije ga je J. Dular pripisivao tipu Stätzing mačeva (Dular 1974: 17-18, T. 2: 14), što je prihvatio i A. Harding, koji ga još razlikuje u varijanti Vrana (Harding 1995: 51-52, T. 21: 178), i uspoređuje ga s kratkim mačevima iz Albanije (Braç i Dukat) (sl. 36: 1). Usp. Jung, Mehofer 2008: 114.

<sup>281</sup> Bianco Peroni 1970: 67-70; Bietti Sestieri 1973: 406. Naziv Stätzing tip jezičastog rukohvata mača prema Schaueru (1971: 144-147) upotrebljava se

in mind when observing the identically presented decoration on the pendant from Krk. The same form of decoration is known from the semilunate razors of the Oblekovice type, especially on the razor from grave number 11 from Ljubljana,<sup>278</sup> which was dated into the same period.<sup>279</sup>

However, apart from personal pieces of attire, also elements of armament have to be added to the category of luxurious items or of those of particular value, among which a special status was attributed to the sword. With the examples of flange-hilted swords the connection of the northern Adriatic and the Aegean territory of the Late Mycenaean and Submycenaean period were well established. It was based on discoveries of swords in known contexts in the Po plain in the vicinity of Frattesina and all the way to Gazzo Veronese.<sup>280</sup> These are sword of the Alleronona type on the territory of the Apennine peninsula and equated to the C type included into the group of Naue II swords according to I. Kilian Dirlmeier on the Aegean territory (fig. 35).<sup>281</sup>

A fragment of such a sword was discovered on the island of Krk in a devastated tumulus in Sužan (cat. 44, fig. 15; 36: 2; 37). Preserved was the largest part of the hilt with strengthened kerb widening at the bottom into the shoulder of the blade. The latter is missing and only a small portion of it with a rhomboid cross-section is preserved (fig. 36: 2). Due to morphological characteristics and dimensions of the fragment, it could be compared to the sword from Braç in Albania,<sup>282</sup> which was, as a short sword, included into type C of the Naue II/Alleronona swords dated into the LHIIIc phase, chronologically parallel to the finds from Tiryns and Perati<sup>283</sup> (fig. 36: 1) and to the almost identical sword from Mycenae.<sup>284</sup> On the other hand on the territory of Italy the appearance and production of this type of swords were defined in relation to the Pila de Brancón hoard which was dated into the BR2/BF1.<sup>285</sup>

The fragment of the sword from Sužan is unfortunately an isolated example from a devastated tumulus located far away from known and located sites on Krk. Still, it is an exceptional find almost surely belonging to the grave of a "warrior". Such "warrior graves" with swords are an exception on the broader Mediterranean territory (fig. 35) and especially in the Aegean cultural area exposing the members of the highest social rank which represented, according to known circumstances, the elite of the leading and wealthy clans of particular societies.<sup>286</sup> Therefore, it was most probably an outstanding and eminent member of the Late Bronze Age society from Krk to have

<sup>278</sup> Starè 1954: T. XII: 2.

<sup>279</sup> Weber 1996: 237-238, T. 50: 556; T. 65.

<sup>280</sup> Salzani 1989: 34-38; Salzani 2002a: 159, Fig. 1: 1; Eder, Jung 2005: 490, Pl. CVIII. The flange-hilted sword from Škocjan was attributed to the Alleronona type, this means to the Catling II/III type by B. Teržan (1984: 111). P. Turk accepted this opinion (Turk 1994: 123, T. 15: 2) and dated it as one of the oldest elements in the depot in Mušja jama – this means in to his II<sup>nd</sup> horizon of hoards. Another opinion was argued by J. Dular who attributed it to the type of Stätzing (Dular 1974: 17-18, T. 2: 14), an opinion accepted by A. Harding who even distinguished two varieties – Vrana (Harding 1995: 51-52, T. 21: 178), and comparing it to the short swords from Albania (Braç and Dukat) (fig. 36: 1). Comp. Jung, Mehofer 2008: 114.

<sup>281</sup> Bianco Peroni 1970: 67-70; Bietti Sestieri 1973: 406. The term Stätzing type of flange-hilted swords according to Schauer (1971: 144-147) is used on the territory of central Europe. Interesting is the Schauer's discussion about the possible chronological difference in the relations of the European-Italic-Aegean swords.


<sup>282</sup> Andrea 1976: 133-135, Pl. I: 1; Bodinaku 1990: 85-95, T. I: 1; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993: 100, cat. 269; Kouï et al. 2006: 51-54.

<sup>283</sup> Jung 2006: 208.

<sup>284</sup> Kouï et al. 2006: 54.

<sup>285</sup> Jung 2006: 148-150, 216.

<sup>286</sup> Eder, Jung 2005: 491.



**Slika 35.** Karta rasprostranjenosti mačeva tipa Alleron/Nauae IIC (■) i mačeva neodređenog tipa Naue II (★) (nadopunjeno prema Bianco Peroni 1970; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993; Harding 1995; Eder, Jung 2005) (Lista 5).

**Figure 35.** Distribution map of the swords of the Alleron/Nauae II type (■) and Naue II, type unknown (★) (supplemented after Bianco Peroni 1970; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993; Harding 1995; Eder, Jung 2005) (List 5).

Ulomak jednog takvog mača nađen je opet na Krku i potječe iz razorenog tumula na Sužanu (kat. 44, sl. 15; 36: 2; 37). Sačuvan je najveći dio rukohvata ravnog oblika, izvučenih i ojačanih rubnika, koja se pri dnu proširuju u ramena. Ona su odlomljena pa je zbog toga sačuvan i samo ulomak sječiva rombičnog presjeka (sl. 36: 2). S obzirom na osnovna obilježja kao i na dimenzije, može se usporediti s mačem iz Barča u Albaniji,<sup>282</sup> koji je kao kratak mač uvršten u Naue II tip C/Alleron mačeva KHIIIC stupnja, vremenski uspoređan s nalazima iz Tirynsa i Perati (sl. 36: 1)<sup>283</sup>, a tehnološki gotovo istovjetan maču iz Mikene.<sup>284</sup> Međutim, pojava tog tipa mača i njegova produkcija na prostoru Italije definirana je u odnosu na vrijeme deponiranja ostave Pila de Brancón, tj. u relativno kronološki korespondent BR2/BF1.<sup>285</sup>

Ulomak mača iz Sužana, nažalost, usamljeni je nalaz iz devastiranog tumula, udaljenog od poznatih i ubiciranih lokaliteta na Krku. Unatoč tomu riječ je o iznimnom predmetu za kojeg se, s podosta sigurnosti, može promišljati kako potječe iz groba "ratnika". Takvi "ratnički

been buried in Sužan and to whom such an emblem was granted for "eternity". The very location of the tumulus, being segregated from the rest of society and far away from the others in Šula or in Garica (fig. 15), might support such a hypothesis. Such a ritual was common e.g. in the Apennines – for instance in Castellace.<sup>287</sup>

Since this type of sword played a major role in long distance contacts of the European Late Bronze Age, it was mostly perceived within the frame of circulation of intercultural communications – the so called *koiné metallurgica*,<sup>288</sup> or "bronzi internazionali",<sup>289</sup> in which the Adriatic basin, in particular its northern part, was equally engaged (fig. 35). This was the period of influential transmission and exchange of luxury goods flowing between the Aegean and the Italic territory, which points at equal communicational systems of these areas, systems not penetrating into their inner regional structures. Principles of personal relations and gifts, principles of mutual desires and hospitality, of mutual exchange of ideas and perspectives are finally determined only by personal decisions of individuals...<sup>290</sup> These are the reasons

za područje srednje Europe. Zanimljiva je Schauerova rasprava oko moguće kronološke prednosti u odnosu europski-italski-egejski tipovi mačeva.

<sup>282</sup> Andrea 1976: 133-135, Pl. I: 1; Bodinaku 1990: 85-95, T. I: 1; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993: 100, kat. 269; Kouli et al. 2006: 51-54.

<sup>283</sup> Jung 2006: 208.

<sup>284</sup> Kouli et al. 2006: 54.

<sup>285</sup> Jung 2006: 148-150, 216.

<sup>287</sup> Comp. Pacciarelli 2000; Eder, Jung 2005: 491.

<sup>288</sup> Bietti Sestieri 1973: 406-408; Carancini, Peroni 1997: 595-601; Carancini, Peroni 1999: 18, 58, T. 28: 44; Bettelli 2002: 122.

<sup>289</sup> Jung 2009.

<sup>290</sup> Eder, Jung 2005: 487, 491-492; Jung 2006: 52. For the direct connection of the north-Italian territory with the Aegean, running on the Adriatic diagonal see Borgna 2009; Jung 2009; Jung, Mehofer 2008; Jung, Mehofer, Pernicka 2011.



grobovi" s mačevima sami po sebi predstavljaju, na širem prostoru Mediterana (sl. 35) poglavito u egejskom kulturnom krugu, iznimku pokopavanja ističući time članove najvišeg ranga društvene ljestvice koji su se, prema poznatim okolnostima nalaženja, srazmjerno profilirali ili izdvajali unutar bogatih i vodećih klanova pojedinih zajednica.<sup>286</sup> Slijedom istoga, vjerojatno je i na Sužanu bio pokopan neki izvanredan i eminentni član krčke zajednice kasnog brončanog doba, kojem je takav amblem bio na "vječnost" priušten. Pretpostavci možda ide u prilog i sam položaj tumula, izdvojen od zajednice u Šuli ili na Garici (sl. 15), podalje od ostalih, što je čest običaj pokapanja i na prostoru Apenina, npr. Castellace.<sup>287</sup>

Budući da je taj tip mača imao veliku ulogu u nadregionalnim kontaktima tijekom europskog kasnobrončanog doba, najčešće se promatra unutar cirkuliranja interkulturnih komunikacija tzv. *koiné metallurgica*,<sup>288</sup> ili "*bronzi internazionali*";<sup>289</sup> u kojoj je jadranski bazen, osobito njegov sjeverni dio, sasvim ravnopravno sudjelovao (sl. 35). To je vrijeme kada se vrši znatna razmjena prestižnih dobara odgovarajuće kvalitete između Egeje i italčkog kopna, što upućuje na istovrijedne komunikacijske sustave tih prostora, koji ne zadiru u njihove regionalne unutrašnje strukture. Princip osobnih relacija i poklona, princip obostrane želje i gostoprimitstva, princip obostrane izmjene ideja i perspektiva, uvjetuje konačan i samo osobni izbor pojedinaca...<sup>290</sup> Konačno, iz tih će razloga i mač iz Sužana predstavljati fenomen, vrijedan pažnje ili promišljanja, posebno stoga što je na prostoru sjevernog Jadrana pokapanje oružja iznimno rijetko, a reflektirati se može i na smisao nakitnih oblika kojima je povezanost sa širim sredozemnim prostorom također dokazana.

## O iglama s lukovičastom glavicom i "Kontinentalnoj" *koiné*

"Kontinentalna" ingerencija iz kompleksa KPŽ predstavlja se kao permanentna pojava određenog intenziteta koja je na prostor Kvarnera otpočela zadirati i nešto ranije nego što je to zabilježeno za Istru. Dobar smjerokaz u takvom promišljanju pruža ulomak igle s bikoničnom, na vrhu spljoštenom i kaneliranom glavicom koja potječe iz špilje Šiljevica (Oštro) kod Kraljevice (kat. 178, sl. 40: 1). Gornji dio glavice manji je od donjeg, a dijeli ih najdeblja središnja kanelura koja je ukrašena kosim urezima. Paralele takvoj igli poznate su u mnoštvu primjeraka, ali se ukrasom ističu najslabije i najbliže iz ostave Siča/Lučica,<sup>291</sup> te one iz šibenskog područja Velike Mrdakovice i Danila.<sup>292</sup> S obzirom na njihovu učestalost na prostranom europskom teritoriju njihova je odlika dokazana za stupnjeve BrD i HaA1, temeljem čega obilježavaju vrijeme ostava II. faze KPŽ sjeverne Hrvatske.<sup>293</sup> S njima su sasvim organski povezani i tako datirani nalazi iz prostora Srijema i Podunavlja,<sup>294</sup> kao i primjerci iz područja Posavine, odnosno grupe Barice-Gređani

<sup>286</sup> Eder, Jung 2005: 491.

<sup>287</sup> Usp. Pacciarelli 2000; Eder, Jung 2005: 491.

<sup>288</sup> Bietti Sestieri 1973: 406-408; Carancini, Peroni 1997: 595-601; Carancini, Peroni 1999: 18, 58, T. 28: 44; Bettelli 2002: 122.

<sup>289</sup> Jung 2009.


<sup>290</sup> Eder, Jung 2005: 487, 491-492; Jung 2006: 52. O izravnoj povezanosti sjevernoitalčkog prostora s egejskim, jadranskom dijagonalom usp. Borgna 2009; Jung 2009; Jung, Mehofer 2008; Jung, Mehofer, Pernicka 2011.

<sup>291</sup> Perkić, Ložnjak Dizdar 2005: 69-70, T. 6: 108.

<sup>292</sup> Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014.

<sup>293</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 74-75.

<sup>294</sup> Vasić 2003: 73-74.



**Slika 36.** Mačevi tipa Allerona/Naue II: 1 - Barç (prema Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993), 2 - Sužan (foto: M. Blečić Kavur).

**Figure 36.** The swords of the Allerona/Naue II type: 1 - Barç (after Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993), 2 - Sužan (Photo: M. Blečić Kavur).


why the Sužan sword presents a phenomenon worth observing and pondering, especially due to the fact that burials of weapons were extremely rare on the northern Adriatic territory, and can be reflected onto the meaning of forms of jewelry whose connection to the broader Aegean area has been clearly proved.

## On pins with onion-shaped head and the "Continental" *koiné*

The "continental" influence of the Urnfield culture complex was permanent and intensive and it reached the Kvarner area before it arrived in Istria. A good confirmation thereof is provided by the presence of a pin from Šiljevica cave (Oštro) near Kraljevica presenting a byconical head, flattened on the top and horizontally grooved (cat. 178, fig. 40: 1). The upper part of the head is smaller than the lower one and the division between them is marked by a central groove decorated with oblique incisions. Numerous comparisons to this pin are known, but considering its decoration, the best analogies are known from the closest (and most recent) discoveries – those from the hoard of Siča/Lučica,<sup>291</sup> from Velika Mrdakovica and Danilo.<sup>292</sup> Spread widely across Europe they are the hallmark of phases BrD and

<sup>291</sup> Perkić, Ložnjak Dizdar 2005: 69-70, T. 6: 108.


<sup>292</sup> Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014.



**Slika 37.** Nalazi iz tumula u Sužanu (kat. 44) i Šuli na otoku Krku (kat. 45-49).

**Figure 37.** Findings from the tumuli of Sužan (cat. 44) and Šula from island Krk (cat. 45-49).





**Slika 38.** Karta rasprostranjenosti igala s većom bikoničnom, na vrhu spljoštenom i kaneliranom glavicom (nadopunjeno prema Dular 2002; Vasić 2003; König 2004a) (Lista 6).

**Figure 38.** Distribution map of the pins with a byconical, on top flattened and horizontally grooved head (supplemented after Dular 2002; Vasić 2003; König 2004a) (List 6).

(sl. 38).<sup>295</sup> Mada se mogu razlikovati u tri varijante, značajnijih kronoloških razlika između njih nema, dapače zajednički se učestalo nalaze baš u ostavama.<sup>296</sup> Prema toj tipološkoj klasifikaciji, sve igle s prostora jadranskog priobalja ubrojiti se mogu u varijantu s kaneliranom glavicom. Prostorna je tako raširenost predmetnih igala prema P. Königu i J. Dularu sada znatno potpunija i ukazuje na stanovitu interakciju kulturnih prostora već od toga vremena,<sup>297</sup> osobito duž posavskog koridora k jugoistočnoalpskom zaleđu i prema sjevernom Jadranu. No s druge strane na italjskom kopnu, izrazito su srodne igle definirane tipom Cisano, rasprostranjene na području Veneta i Lombardije i određene također u vrijeme 12. stoljeća prema L. G. Caranciniju,<sup>298</sup> odnosno tako su vrednovane i u novijim kronologijama faze BR.<sup>299</sup> Istovremenost, dakle, i te nadregionalne modne, funkcionalnog elementa, nošnje na heterogenom, a opet povezanom europskom području, i ovim je primjerkom još jednom afirmirana.

Podršku takvoj argumentaciji pružaju, nadalje, igle s većom, okruglom i glatkom glavicom, kao prepoznatljivim elementom toga vremena i prostora od sjeverne Hrvatske do Srijema i istočne Srbije.<sup>300</sup> Na čitavom sjevernom Jadranu, pa tako i Kvarneru rijetka su pojava, i za sada samo jedan primjerak potječe iz Rijeke (kat. 121, sl. 40: 2). Vrlo slična igla poznata nam je i iz važne grobne cjeline

HaA1, consequently they are an element present in the hoards of the II<sup>nd</sup> phase of the Urnfield culture of Continental Croatia<sup>293</sup> with several examples of different variants on the territory between the Drava, Danube and Sava rivers. Naturally linked and similarly dated are the finds from the territory of Srijem and the Danube basin,<sup>294</sup> as well as examples known from the Sava valley from the Barice-Gredani cultural group (fig. 38).<sup>295</sup> Although they can be distinguished into three variants, there are no significant chronological differences between them – they actually often appear together in hoards.<sup>296</sup> According to their typological classification, all pins from the Adriatic coastal belt could be included into the group with a grooved head. The spatial distribution presented by P. König and J. Dular is now more complete and point at the constant interaction of cultural territories from that period onwards,<sup>297</sup> in particular along the Sava corridor leading towards the south-eastern Alpine hinterlands and the northern Adriatic. However, on the other side, on the Italian territory, these pins are known as the Cisano type and are spread across the territory of Veneto and Lombardy and according to L. G. Carancini dated into the 12<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>298</sup> a chronological position confirmed in newer chronologies of the phase BR.<sup>299</sup> It is by means of this example that the synchronicity of this "super-regional" fashion of functional elements of attire can be confirmed once again.

<sup>295</sup> König 2004a: 69, T. 90A; usp. Dular 2002: 218-219, Sl. 49; Ludajić 2011: T. IX: 6; Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014.

<sup>296</sup> Dular 2002: 219.

<sup>297</sup> König 2004a: T. 90A; Dular 2002: Sl. 49.

<sup>298</sup> Carancini 1975: 239, T. 108E.

<sup>299</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1999: 18.

<sup>300</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 70-71; Vasić 2003: 58-59, T. 57.

<sup>293</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 74-75.

<sup>294</sup> Vasić 2003: 73-74.

<sup>295</sup> König 2004a: 69, T. 90A; comp. Dular 2002: 218-219, Sl. 49; Ludajić 2011: T. IX: 6; Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014.

<sup>296</sup> Dular 2002: 219.

<sup>297</sup> König 2004a: T. 90A; Dular 2002: Sl. 49.


<sup>298</sup> Carancini 1975: 239, T. 108E.

<sup>299</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1999: 18.

nekropole Zagreb-Vrapče, iz groba 1,<sup>301</sup> dok je odgovarajući analogni primjerci povezuju i sa susjednim notranjskim i škocjanskim područjem. Naime, na Šmihelu je dokumentirana kao pojedinačni nalaz,<sup>302</sup> a na škocjanskom prostoru u ostavi dugog trajanja iz Mušje jame<sup>303</sup> iz vremenskog raspona II. do IV. stupnja prema P. Turku.<sup>304</sup> Zbog toga nam ni ti nalazi ne mogu poslužiti za njezinu precizniju dataciju. Nešto je sigurniji kontekst igle s okruglom glavicom iz groba 9 nekropole na dvorištu SAZU,<sup>305</sup> općenito opredijeljenog u stupanj Ljubljana la pokopavanja na toj nekropoli.<sup>306</sup> Slične igle, samo s manjom okruglom glavicom, koje su također zastupljene na prostoru sjevernog Jadrana, sasvim su pak pouzdano datirane na nalazištu Hauterive-Champréveyres i to u 11. stoljeće, što odgovara prijelaznoj fazi HaA2/B1<sup>307</sup> i po tome su nešto mlađe od igala s većom okruglom glavicom i primjeraka iz nalazišta kompleksa KPŽ sjeverne Hrvatske ili srpskog Podunavlja.

Općenito, u isti se vremenski horizont pripisuju ravne igle s raskovanom i spiralno uvijenom glavicom kakve potječu iz Garice (kat. 156-157), ali poznate su još i iz Klačenice (kat. 190) te iz Rijeke (kat. 122). Igle iz Garice i Klačenice D. Glogović usporedila je sa srodnim primjercima iz istočnoalpskog prostora, određujući njihovu širu dataciju prema analognim primjercima iz Notranjske, Ljubljane i Dobove, datirajući ih u 10. i 9. stoljeće.<sup>308</sup> Isti tip igala susreće se često i na istarskim nekropolama gdje su datirane u fazu Istra Ib/Ila, pri čemu je oslonac za dataciju pružila manšetasta narebrena narukvicama i žara tipa kanelirane šalice iz dječjeg groba VI/15 iz Nezakcija.<sup>309</sup> Međutim, na veronskom nalazištu Desmontà takve su igle nađene u zatvorenim grobnim cjelinama u paru s iglama tipa Cles i Fiavé te stoga preciznije datirane u vrijeme HaB1-B2.<sup>310</sup> Budući da kvarnerske igle nemaju pobližih podataka o nalaženju mogu se samo uvjetno vremenski smjestiti. No izgleda da će primjerak iz Garice biti nešto starijeg datuma, ako poštujemo ostale istovremene nalaze materijalne kulture, dok se za igle iz Klačenice i Rijeke može odrediti i nešto širi vremenski raspon uporabe tijekom HaB stupnjeva.

No vratimo se repertoaru nalaza iz Stolniča. Kako je rečeno, taj je nalaz osobit i zbog sigurno fiksirane pojave dugačke igle s lukovičastom glavicom i tordiranim, blago zadržanim vratom (kat. 4, sl. 19).<sup>311</sup> I po tome će elementu bitnu paralelu obilježavati



**Slika 39.** Karta rasprostranjenosti igala tipa Šula (●), varijante s četvrtasto profiliranim zadebljanjem vrata (■) i varijante sa spiralno ukrašenom glavicom (▲): crveni krug vjerojatno igle tipa Šula? (nadopunjeno prema Blečić Kavur 2011) (Lista 7).

**Figure 39.** Distribution map of the pins of the Šula type (●), variants with a twisted neck of a square cross-section (■) and variant with spiral decorated head (▲): red circle probably pins of the Šula type? (supplemented after Blečić Kavur 2011) (List 7).

Apart from the abovementioned pins, the examples with a smooth round head are among the most recognizable finds of that period on the territory stretching from northern Croatia to Srijem and Eastern Serbia.<sup>300</sup> On the Adriatic area and in Kvarner they are a rare find and only a single example from Rijeka is known so far (cat. 121) (fig. 40: 2). A similar pin is known from the most important grave, grave 1, from the cemetery of Zagreb-Vrapče,<sup>301</sup> whereas several similar finds are known from the territory of Škocjan and Notranjska – in Šmihel a similar find was discovered as a stray find<sup>302</sup> while another one is known from the long lasting hoard of Mušja jama<sup>303</sup> dated into a period from the II<sup>nd</sup> to the IV<sup>th</sup> phase of hoards according to P. Turk<sup>304</sup> – consequently they cannot suggest a precise chronological position. A precise context with such a pin was discovered in grave number 9 from the necropolis on the yard of the Slovenian Academy of Arts and Sciences in

<sup>301</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 70-71, T. 23: 4; Mihelić 2011: 128-129.

<sup>302</sup> Guštin 1979: T. 59: 1; Igle iz Šmihela (Guštin 1979: T. 59: 1-2) M. Sakara Sučević tipološki izjednačuje iako se one morfološki, oblikom glavice, sasvim razlikuju. To se odnosi i na paralele koje je autorica ponudila za iglu iz Kaštelira kod Nove Vasi (Sakara Sučević 2004: 20-21, 161, kat. 20), koja prema svim odlikama okrugle glavice ima najbolju analogiju kod druge igle iz Šmihela (Guštin 1979: T. 59: 2), a ne kod prve kako je to autorica prikazala. Cjelokupno navedene analogije s iglama iz brežečkih grobova nisu odgovarajuće, jer se zapravo odnose na igle s koničnom glavicom, kako u tekstu tako i na karti (vidjeti kod Guštin 1975: 470-472, Sl. 2)!?

<sup>303</sup> Guštin 1979: T. C1; Batović 1980: 34, T. 1: 18.

<sup>304</sup> Turk 1994: 103-146; Turk 1996: 109, 113, 115.

<sup>305</sup> Starè 1954: 26, 87, T. 10: 2.

<sup>306</sup> Gabrovec 1975: 342, T. 1; O kronološkom preciznijem određenju pokopavanja na ljubljanskoj nekropoli, s mogućnošću izdvajanja i najstarijeg horizonta BrD/HaA1, kao i o sinkronizaciji njezina groba 2 (i time I. stupnja) s grobom 9 iz Dobove i nalazima iz Šule, tj. horizonta lučnih fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, uz pomoć igala s lukovičastom glavicom i tordiranim vratom vidjeti kod B. Teržan (1995: 357-360). Diskusiju o navedenim iglama i njihovim datacijama vidjeti dalje u tekstu.

<sup>307</sup> Rychner-Faraggi 1993: T. 72: 14, 25.

<sup>308</sup> Glogović 1989: 9.

<sup>309</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 56-57, T. 47: 14; Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987: 303; Sakara Sučević 2004: 18, kat. 22.

<sup>310</sup> Salzani 1984: 215, Fig. 2: 2-3, 11-12.

<sup>311</sup> Ulomak igle iz Vrbnika, s gradine Kostriļj, zbog dužine i načina izvedbe, nedvo-


<sup>300</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 70-71; Vasić 2003: 58-59, T. 57.

<sup>301</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 70-71, T. 23: 4; Mihelić 2011: 128-129.

<sup>302</sup> Guštin 1979: T. 59: 1. The pins from Šmihel (Guštin 1979: T. 59: 1-2) were despite their obvious differences in form of the head typologically equated by M. Sakara Sučević. This is true also for the comparisons which were listed by the author for the pin from Kaštelir near Nova vas (Sakara Sučević 2004: 20-21, 161, cat. 20) which has, according to all characteristics of the round head the best comparison in the second pin from Šmihel (Guštin 1979: T. 59: 2), and not in the first one as listed by the author. Generally comparisons with the pins from the graves from Brežec were not adequate since they are referring to the pins with a conical head – this was done in the text as well as on the tables (see in Guštin 1975: 470-472, Sl. 2)!?

<sup>303</sup> Guštin 1979: T. C1; Batović 1980: 34, T. 1: 18.

<sup>304</sup> Turk 1994: 103-146; Turk 1996: 109, 113, 115.



**Slika 40.** Usporedni prikaz igala u tipološkom i kronološkom odnosu; 1-Kraljevica, 2-Rijeka, 3-4 Šula, 5-Dobova (prema Starè 1975), 6-Ljubljana (prema Starè 1954), 7-Stolnić, 8-Škocjan (prema Batović 1980), 9-Nezakcij (prema Mihovilić 2001a), 10-Osor, 11-Garica, 12-Dobova (prema Starè 1957a), 13-Kainach (prema Blečić Kavur 2011), 14-Campi Neri di Cles (prema Carancini 1975), 15-Morano sul Po (prema Giaretti, Rubat Borel 2006), 16-Nezakcij (prema Mihovilić 2001a), 17-Brinjeva Gora (prema V. Pahič 1989).

**Figure 40.** Typological and chronological table of pins; 1-Kraljevica, 2-Rijeka, 3-4 Šula, 5-Dobova (after Starè 1975), 6-Ljubljana (after Starè 1954), 7-Stolnić, 8-Škocjan (after Batović 1980), 9-Nezakcij (after Mihovilić 2001a), 10-Osor, 11-Garica, 12-Dobova (after Starè 1957a), 13-Kainach (after Blečić Kavur 2011), 14-Campi Neri di Cles (after Carancini 1975), 15-Morano sul Po (after Giaretti, Rubat Borel 2006), 16-Nezakcij (after Mihovilić 2001a), 17-Brinjeva Gora (after V. Pahič 1989).

nakitni nalazi igala iz Šule (kat. 47-48, sl. 37).<sup>312</sup> O tim je iglama već bilo rasprave. Klasificirane su, naime, kao tip Šula, karakterističnih tehnoloških i dekorativnih obilježja. Rasprostirale su se ponajviše na Kvarneru s ukupno 5 ili 6 primjeraka te dalje do škocjanskog kulturnog prostora<sup>313</sup> i Posavine, od Bleda<sup>314</sup> do Dobove (sl. 39).<sup>315</sup>

jbeno pripada ovom tipu igala (kat. 203). Pribrojiti im se svakako treba i izgubljena igla iz Grižana, pa će tako inventar nalaza iz Grižana neodoljivo podsjećati na upravo onaj iz Stolniča ili čak iz Šule (vidjeti katalog Tribalj-Grižane)!

<sup>312</sup> Matejčić 1966: 336-339; Glogović 1987: 74-75, T. I: 1; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 4: 2-3.

<sup>313</sup> Righi 1977: T. XXVIII: Sn 28; Vitri 1983: Fig. 28A; Guštin 1979: T. C: 136, 139. Igle različitih varijanti iz grobova nekropole Brežec uspoređivane su s tolminskim iglama (Teržan 2002: 87), koje se ipak sve međusobno unekoliko razlikuju. Npr. igla iz groba 124: 1 približava se tipu Marco, dakle s bikoničnom glavicom, a igla iz groba 154: 2 zapravo nema glavicu i mogla je doista biti dijelom lučne dvodijelne fibule tipa Osor, varijante Krk, kakve su poznate iz Krka, Punta i Nina, što bi potvrđivali luk fibule i brončana raskovana alka, a to je uostalom smatrala i S. Vitri (Vitri 1977: 88-89).

<sup>314</sup> Iгла iz Ljubljance ima okruglu glavicu i naglašeno tordiran vrat (Turk 2009: 206-207, kat. 17) kojoj je izravna paralela igla iz groba 110 u Dobovi (Starè 1975: T. 18: 14).

<sup>315</sup> Glogović 1989: 9-10; Teržan 1995: 359, Abb. 25-26. Možda se toj grupi nalaza može pribrojiti i igla iz Novalje (kat. 34) i iz nepoznatog nalazišta sjeverne Dalmacije koja ima nešto okruglastiji oblik glavice (AMZd) (Batović 1980: 34, T. V: 9). Isto može poslužiti i za iglu s okruglom glavicom i tordiranim vratom iz Donje Doline (Gavranović 2011/II, Kat. Abb. 95, 3). U novijem pokušaju interpretiranja toga gradiva uspoređena je upravo s iglama tipa Šula, koja bi možda mogla obilježavati, baš kao i ona dalmatinska, neki njezin daljnji derivat. Pre-

Ljubljana (SAZU).<sup>305</sup> It was included into the burial phase Ljubljana Ia of the necropolis.<sup>306</sup> Similar pins, but with a smaller head, are present on the territory of northern Adriatic, but they are exactly dated into the 11th century on the site of Hauterive-Champréveyres, which corresponds to phase HaA2/B1<sup>307</sup> and are a bit younger as supposed for the examples with a larger head from the area of the Urnfield culture of northern Croatia and the Serbian Danube basin.

Generally, we could include into the same chronological horizon the straight pins with a hammered and spirally rolled up head deriving from Garica (cat. 156-157), Klačenica (cat. 190) and Rijeka (cat. 122). D. Glogović compared the pins from Garica and Klačenica to similar examples from the eastern Alpine area and dated them, based on analogies from Notranjska, Ljubljana and Dobova, to the 10<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>308</sup> Finds of the same type were often discovered on necropolises in Istria where they are dated into the phase Istria Ib/Ila,

<sup>305</sup> Starè 1954: 26, 87, T. 10: 2.

<sup>306</sup> Gabrovec 1975: 342, T. 1. For a detailed chronological determination of the Ljubljana necropolis, with the possibility of identification of the oldest horizon from the Bd D/HaA1 as well as the synchronization of the grave 2 (and the phase I) with the grave 9 from Dobova and the finds from Šula, this means the horizon of bowed fibulae with two knobs on the bow, with the help of pins with a onion-shaped head and a twisted neck see B. Teržan (1995: 357-360). For the discussion about these pins and their dating see further in the text.

<sup>307</sup> Rychner-Faraggi 1993: T. 72: 14, 25.

<sup>308</sup> Glogović 1989: 9.

Pribrojava im se i noviji nalaz igala iz Jokine Glavice kod Krneze, koje najvjerojatnije obilježavaju mjesnu varijantu s ukrašenom glavicom (sl. 39).<sup>316</sup> S obzirom na kontekste pojedinih nalaza, vremenska odrednica korištenja smještena im je u HaA stupanj prema srednjoeuropskoj kronologiji (sl. 40).<sup>317</sup>

Igle tipa Šula u raznim su ogledima njihova definiranja, ili izvorišnog potencijala njihova nastanka, poglavito stavljanje u bliži odnos s iglama iz sjeverne Italije. Ondje se, na teritoriju kulture Protogolasecca, nalazi više varijanti igala s lukovičastom/bikoničnom glavicom i tordiranim vratom, od tipa Ala i Fivè, do tipa Marco i Cles (sl. 43-44). Kako je pokazano, sve one ipak pripadaju sljedećoj generaciji igala srodnog tipa i značajne su za vrijeme HaB1/B2 horizonta što, uz ostale oblike nošnje i nakita, dobro argumentiraju podatci iz Hauterive-Champréveyres.<sup>318</sup> Tako izravno svjedoče o njihovom vremenskom rasponu druge polovine 11. do kraja 10. stoljeća korigirane periodizacije.<sup>319</sup> Ista datacija trebala bi biti prihvaćena i za njihovo zatjecanje u širem prostornom kontekstu,<sup>320</sup> što dakle vrijedi i za nalaze iz Nezakcija (sl. 40: 15-16; 43) i za iglu iz tumula Jokine Glavice kod Krneze (sl. 43, 44).<sup>321</sup> Činjenica bi potom morala biti primijenjena i na dvije, tj. tri, igle iz Donje Doline<sup>322</sup> koje su, nažalost, tretirane istovjetno s iglom iz Tijesno Vrbasa.<sup>323</sup> Međutim, one se između sebe podosta razlikuju, pa tako igle iz Donje doline imaju ispred svega lukovičasto oblikovane glavice, spuštenog i zadebljanog vrata na kojima je ornament izveden urezanim snopovima linija u cik-cak maniri. Stoga im valja pridodati i treću iglu iz istog nalazišta, od koje je, doduše, ostao samo tako prepoznatljiv vrat.<sup>324</sup> Njihove značajke vrlo izričito ukazuju na znatno zapadnije paralele te ih gotovo sa sigurnošću možemo usporediti s identično izrađenim iglama tipa Ala karakterističnim za sjevernoitalsko područje.<sup>325</sup> Iglu iz Tijesno Vrbasa ima pak izrazito bikonično oblikovanu glavicu, te urezivanjem od same glavice vodoravnim i djelomično cik-cak linijama ukrašen ravan vrat. Oblikovno i ukrasno paralele za navedeni primjerak zasigurno su odgovarajuće kod igala tipa Cles, varijante B, koje su tipične za područje Trentina,<sup>326</sup> ali i šireg alpskog prostora sve do štajerskog praga Panonije, što je za primjerak igle iz Tijesno Vrbasa već izričito upozorila Barbara Nadbath.<sup>327</sup>

sko vremensko smještanje igle iz Donje Doline u HaB1 stupanj (Gavranović 2011/I, 163, Abb. 162, 16), nije posve adekvatno, već se njezina pojava mora razumijevati u vremenu HaA stupnja. Tako niskoj dataciji kumovala je naravno usporedba s nalazom iz "navodnog groba" iz Grižane, osnovana na prisustvu zmijaste dvodijelne fibule, koja ne pripada poznatoj grižanskoj skupini nalaza. O tome vidjeti dalje u tekstu i katalog *Grižane*.

<sup>316</sup> Marijanović 2012: 34-36, T. I: 2; T. VI: 3.

<sup>317</sup> Blečić Kavur 2011: 57-58; Glede datacije, već je i Ph. Della Casa usporedio naše igle iz Šule s iglama tzv. spljoštene glavice, preciznije s iglom okruglastije glavice i tordiranim vratom iz Isea u Lombardiji (Carancini 1975, 243-244, T. 14: 1787), koja je posve adekvatno datirana u BR/BF horizont (Della Casa 1996: 150), što zapravo odgovara i ovdje predloženim datacijama.

<sup>318</sup> Rychner-Faraggi 1993: Pl. 55: 8-10.

<sup>319</sup> Rychener 1995: 483-484, Abb. 24; Rychener et al. 1996: 309-311.

<sup>320</sup> Trachsel 2004: 263-265, Abb. 162: 17; De Marinis 2005: 19-38, T. 4-6.

<sup>321</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 61, T. 43: 12-13; Blečić Kavur 2011: Abb. 2; Abb. 8, 15; Marijanović 2012: 36, T. V: 3.

<sup>322</sup> Gavranović 2011/II: Abb. 92, 2; Abb. 93, 1.

<sup>323</sup> Gavranović 2011/II: Abb. 193.

<sup>324</sup> Marić 1964: T. I: 17.

<sup>325</sup> Carancini 1975: T. 47: 1445-1453, T. 109E.

<sup>326</sup> Carancini 1975: T. 47: 1436-1439; usp. Pare 1998: 314, Abb. 8: 24.

<sup>327</sup> Nadbath 2004: 62, T. 5: 5. Relativna pozicija BrD i HaA1 za nalaz igala iz oba nalazišta, u interpretaciji M. Gavranovića (2011/I: 160-162, Abb. 162: 3-5, 12), previsoka je i time što nisu ponuđene zatvorene cjeline, koje bi nagovarale takvoj dataciji, i time što ne možemo apsolutno i samo uvažavati dataciju koju je svojevremeno za istovjetni tip igala, tj. za njegov tip *Graz* predlagao

based on the finds of a cuff-shaped ribbed bracelet and an urn of a cup-shape with oblique grooves from the infant grave VI/15 from Nesactium.<sup>309</sup> However, on the site of Desmontà in Verona such pins were discovered in graves in pairs with the pins of the Cles and Fivè types consequently precisely dated into the period of HaB1-B2.<sup>310</sup> Since the pins from Kvarner lack known contexts of discovery, they can be only indirectly dated. By taking into consideration other finds from the site, the pin from Garica could be a bit older, but the pins from Klačnica and Rijeka could be dated into a broader chronological horizon during the HaB.

Let us return to the find from Stolnić. As mentioned above, it is special because of the well dated long pin with an onion-shaped head and a twisted, slightly thickened neck (cat. 4, fig. 19).<sup>311</sup> Due to its characteristics the pin from Šula presents a close parallel (cat. 47-48, fig. 37).<sup>312</sup> These pins were already discussed – based on their specific technological and decorative characteristics; they were classified as the Šula type. Present in larger number on the territory of Kvarner (5 or 6 examples), they were discovered further on the territory of Škocjan<sup>313</sup> and in Posavina, as well as along the Sava river corridor in Bled<sup>314</sup> and Dobova (fig. 39).<sup>315</sup> We could add to them the recent discovery from Jokina Glavica near Krneza, which most probably represents a local variant with a decorated head (fig. 39).<sup>316</sup> Due to their contexts their use could be dated into the period of HaA according to the central-European chronology (fig. 40).<sup>317</sup>

<sup>309</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 56-57, T. 47: 14; Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987: 303; Sakara Sučević 2004: 18, cat. 22.

<sup>310</sup> Salzani 1984: 215, Fig. 2: 2-3, 11-12.

<sup>311</sup> The fragment of the pin from Vrbnik, originating from the hill fort of Kostrilj, due to its length and elaboration beyond doubt belongs to this type of pins (cat. 203). We should add to them also the lost pin from Grižane making consequently the inventory from Grižane to look like the one from Stolnić (see catalogue Tribalj-Grižane)!

<sup>312</sup> Matejčić 1966: 336-339; Glogović 1987: 74-75, T. I: 1; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 4: 2-3.

<sup>313</sup> Righi 1977: T. XXVIII: Sn 28; Vitri 1983: Fig. 28A; Guštin 1979: T. C: 136, 139. Pins of different varieties from graves in Brežec were compared to pins from graves in Tolmin (Teržan 2002: 87), which all differ from one another. For example the pin from grave 124: 1 is close to the Marco type, this means it has a byconical head, while the pin from grave 154: 2 actually does not have the head and could have been a part of a bowed bipartite fibula of the Osor type, Krk variant – as were known from Krk, Punat and Nin. We could consider as a further confirmation of this thesis the presence of the fragment of the bow and a bronze hammered sling, as considered by S. Vitri (1977: 88-89).

<sup>314</sup> The pin from river Ljubljana has a round head and accentuated twisted neck (Turk 2009: 206-207, cat. 17) and has a direct comparison in the pin from grave 110 in Dobova (Starè 1975: T. 18: 14).

<sup>315</sup> Glogović 1989: 9-10; Teržan 1995: 359, Abb. 25-26. Perhaps we could add to this group also the pin from Novalja (cat. 34) and from an unknown locality in northern Dalmatia which has a slightly different form of the head (AMZd) (Batović 1980: 34, T. V: 9). The same could be claimed for the pin with a rounded head and twisted neck from Donja Dolina (Gavranović 2011/II, Kat. Abb. 95, 3) which was in a recent attempt to interpret it, compared with the pins of the Šula type which might have had characterized, as well as the Dalmatian example, a certain distant derivation of it. Also non adequate is the young dating of the pin from Donja Dolina to HaB1 (Gavranović 2011/I, 163, Abb. 162, 16). Its appearance should be considered in the framework of HaA. The argument for a younger date was the comparison with the "assumed grave" from Grižane, based on the presence of a two-part serpentine fibula which clearly does not belong to the group of finds from Grižane. See the discussion further in the text.

<sup>316</sup> Marijanović 2012: 34-36, T. I: 2; T. VI: 3.

<sup>317</sup> Blečić Kavur 2011: 57-58. Regarding their dating it was already Ph. Della Casa who compared the pin from Šula with the pins with the so-called flattened head – more exactly with a pin with a rounded head and twisted neck from Iseo in Lombardy (Carancini 1975, 243-244, T. 14: 1787) – the later was adequately dated in to the horizon BR/BF (Della Casa 1996: 150), which actually corresponds to the proposed dating.

S Kvarnera doista potječe fantastičan raspon varijanti i tipova igala s lukovičastom glavicom, zato valja dalje pozornost usmjeriti i k igli s lukovičastom, narebrenom glavicom, s ovalnim vretenastim zadebljanjem na vratu iz Osora (kat. 54, sl. 40: 10; 41).<sup>328</sup> Srodni se primjerci mogu vidjeti kod igala iz Biljana Donjih, Nina i Varvare. Prema općim morfološkim karakteristikama približavaju se skupini igala *poprečno narebrenе glavice sa zadebljanim vratom varijante A* prema G. L. Caranciniju, kojima se najveća gustoća nalaženja prati na području Lombardije i Veneta, posebno Peschiere, sa smještanjem u vrijeme BR, 12. stoljeća.<sup>329</sup> Igla iz Osora izrazito je korodirana pa se na vratu ne vidi jasno kombinacija ukrasnih motiva linija, iako je ona morala biti prisutna što se vidi iz par urezanih linija ispod glavice. Nasuprot tomu horizontalna plitka narebrenja glavice izražajni su, i to po tri u donjem i u gornjem dijelu. Igla iz Nina<sup>330</sup> upravo tomu svjedoči jer ima isto tako narebrenu glavicu, a zadebljanje na vratu ukrašeno s par vanjskih paralelnih linija i s unutarnjim šrafiranim međusobno povezanim rombovima na zadebljanom dijelu. S obzirom na oblikovanje i način ukrašavanja ovalno zadebljanog vrata može im se približiti i igla iz Krneza-Duševićeva Glavica, nesigurnih okolnosti nalaženja.<sup>331</sup> Geometrijski ukras ravnih i kosih linija od vrata preko zadebljanja izveden je urezivanjem. No glavica igle je lukovičasta, ali potpuno glatka bez ikakvih tragova ukrašavanja, čime se kao određena varijanta na temu, razlikuje od opisanih igala iz Osora ili Nina. Igle pak iz Biljana Donjih i Varvare po obliku glavice, izrazito laganog zadebljanja vrata i znatno reduciranog načina ukrašavanja, odskaču od navedenih primjeraka i doista bi mogle predstavljati neku zajedničku, možda stariju varijantu.<sup>332</sup>

Budući da niti jedan od navedenih primjera nema jasniji kontekst nalaženja, kao uporištem preciznije i čvršće datacije, stilske i tipološke karakteristike zasigurno će samo načelno usmjeravati na razdoblje HaA stupnja i široko primjenjivane mode velikih igala s lukovičastom glavicom. Tomu bi eventualno moglo pogodovati i nalaženje ninske igle upravo zajedno s importiranom fibulom sa dva dvostruko profilirana dugmeta na luku (sl. 18), asocirajući i ovog puta na inventare nošnji iz kvarnerskih nalazišta (sl. 42).

U daljnjem analiziranju građe, ispostavlja se još jedna igla s lukovičastom glavicom koja, nažalost, potječe iz nekropole u Garici. Igla je masivnije i čvršće izradbe, naglašenog i gusto tordiranog vrata, kojeg od lukovičaste glavice dijeli četvrtasto profilirano zadebljanje (kat. 155, sl. 40: 11).<sup>333</sup> Paralele toj igli nisu poznate, iako po osnovnoj formi i izvedbi ukrasa odgovara prije opisanim iglama iz koje je po svoj prilici i izvedena. Ali, to četvrtasto profilirano zadebljanje anticipira i određenu razliku među njima, ne nužno radio-ničku, ali izrađivačku i kronološku. Svojom masivnošću i izvedbom zadebljanog tordiranog vrata vrlo su podobne prije spomenutim iglama iz Ljubljance, Dobove, pa čak i Škocjana. Idejno, četvrtasto

In a different attempt at their definition or the definition of their origins Šula type pins were linked to the pins from northern Italy. There, on the territory of the Protogolasecca culture several different types of pins with byconical, circular or onion-shaped heads, with twisted or only decorated neck were precisely determined and differentiated from types Ala and Fiavè to types of Marco and Cles (fig. 43-44). As demonstrated, all of them belong to the next generation of related pins which were typical, among other finds, of the HaB1-B2 phase at the site of Hauterive-Champréveyres.<sup>318</sup> They indicate directly their chronological range from the second half of the 11<sup>th</sup> century until the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century of the corrected chronology.<sup>319</sup> The same dating should be accepted also for them in the wider area of their occurrence,<sup>320</sup> also for the finds from Nesactium (fig. 40: 15-16; 43) and for the pin from Jokina Glavica near Krneza (fig. 43, 44).<sup>321</sup> This should be applied also to the two or three pins from Donja Dolina,<sup>322</sup> which were considered as being identical with the pin from Tijesno Vrbasa.<sup>323</sup> Still, they differ considerably – most of all the pins from Donja Dolina have onion-shaped heads, a lowered and thickened neck decorated with sheaves of incised zigzag lines. Therefore, we should add to them the remains of the third pin from the side from which only the recognizable neck was preserved.<sup>324</sup> Their characteristics clearly indicate western comparisons and could be almost surely compared with identically produced pins of the Ala type, typical of the north-Italian territory.<sup>325</sup> The pin from Tijesno Vrbasa has a distinctively byconical shaped head and a straight neck decorated with horizontal and only partially zigzag formed incisions. In the formal and decorative sense, comparisons for this type of pins should be sought in those of the Cles type which are characteristic for the territory of Trentino,<sup>326</sup> but also to the broadest Alpine territory stretching all the way to the Pannonian threshold in Styria – which was clearly noted for the pin from Tijesno Vrbasa by Barbara Nadbath.<sup>327</sup>

A truly fantastic range of variants and types of pins with onion-shaped heads came from the Kvarner territory. Consequently, we should further pay attention to the pin with an onion-shaped, ribbed head and with an oval spindle like thickening on the neck from Osor (cat. 54, fig. 40: 10; 41).<sup>328</sup> Similar pins are known from Biljane Donje, Nin and Varvara. According to the general morphologic characteristics, they are close to the group of pins with obliquely ribbed heads and a thickened head of the variant A, according to G. L. Carancini, which are most common on the territory of Lombardy and Veneto, especially in Peschiere, where they were dated into the period of BR,

J. Říhový (1979: 91). Isti se autor i sam potom ispravlja, potvrđujući moguću daljnju dataciju do HaB1 stupnja nalazima iz Velemszentvida i ostave iz Reipersdorfa (Říhový 1983: 17-18, T. 6: 75-76.), koji su zapravo kronološki manje uvjerljivi s obzirom na njihove kontekste, a *nota bene* za potonji, vrlo mali ulomak iz Reipersdorfa uopće nije nužno da pripada iglama, kako je uostalom pokazao i sam F. Mayer (1977: 219, T. 87: 1290).

<sup>328</sup> Čus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 498, T. 4: 4; usp. Hiller 1991: 207.

<sup>329</sup> Carancini 1975: 191-192, 194, T. 43: 1313-1321, T. 107G; usp. Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 104: 19-21.

<sup>330</sup> Neobjavljeno, Muzej ninskih starina, Nin.

<sup>331</sup> Gusar, Vujević 2012: 111, Sl. 7, T. V: 1.

<sup>332</sup> Poneki autori smatraju da je riječ o iglama iz srednjeg brončanog doba, temeljem čega je bila datirana i igla iz Osora (Čus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 498).

<sup>333</sup> Ljubić 1876: 28, T. III: 20.

<sup>318</sup> Rychner-Faraggi 1993: Pl. 55: 8-10.

<sup>319</sup> Rychener 1995: 483-484, Abb. 24; Rychener et al. 1996: 309-311.

<sup>320</sup> Trachsel 2004: 263-265, Abb. 162: 17; De Marinis 2005: 19-38, T. 4-6.

<sup>321</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 61, T. 43: 12-13; Blečić Kavur 2011: Abb. 2; Abb. 8, 15; Marijanović 2012: 36, T. V: 3.

<sup>322</sup> Gavranović 2011/II: Abb. 92, 2; Abb. 93, 1.

<sup>323</sup> Gavranović 2011/II: Abb. 193.

<sup>324</sup> Marić 1964: T. I: 17.


<sup>325</sup> Carancini 1975: T. 47: 1445-1453, T. 109E.

<sup>326</sup> Carancini 1975: T. 47: 1436-1439; comp. Pare 1998: 314, Abb. 8: 24.


<sup>327</sup> Nadbath 2004: 62, T. 5: 5. The relative position in to BrD and HaA1 for the discoveries of pins from both site as mentioned in the interpretation of M. Gavranović (2011/I: 160-162, Abb. 162: 3-5, 12) is too high and lacking the closed contexts, which would support such a dating, we can only absolutely and only acknowledge the dating which was proposed for an identical type of pins, the so called type Graz, by J. Říhový (1979: 91). Based on the finds from Velemszentvid and the hoard from Reipersdorf he later corrected his position allowing a further duration of these in to HaB1 (Říhový 1983: 17-18, T. 6: 75-76) arguing it with finds which are due to their context chronologically less persuasive. And finally *nota bene* the very small fragment from Reipersdorf is not necessary a fragment of a pin at all, as it was already demonstrated by F. Mayer (1977: 219, T. 87: 1290).

<sup>328</sup> Čus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 498, T. 4: 4; comp. Hiller 1991: 207.





Slika 41. Pojedinačni predmeti istraženi na nekropoli Kavanela u Osoru.



**Figure 41.** Individual finds from necropolis on Kavanela in Osor.

	Lučne fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku <i>Bow fibulae with two knobs on the bow</i>	Manšetaste narebrenene narukvice <i>Ribbed cuff-shaped bracelets</i>	Igle s lukovičastom glavicom i tordiranim vratom <i>Pins with an onion-shaped head and a twisted neck</i>	Narukvice dvoslivnog presjeka <i>Bracelets with a double-pitch cross-section</i>
Škocjan	X	X	X	X
Stolnič	X	X	X	
Šula	X	X	X	
Garica	X	X	X	
Osor	X	X		X
Novalja	X	X		X
Grižane	X			X
Baška	X?			X

**Slika 42.** Usporedna kombinacijska tabela nalaza nošnje iz grobova obrađivanih u tekstu.

**Figure 42.** Table demonstrating an overview of attire from sites mentioned in the research.

profilirano zadebljanje i tordiran blago zadebljani vrat imaju i igle iz područja Furlanije, sve bez poznatog mjesta nalazišta, zato su i jednostavno datirane u vrijeme BF prema G. L. Caranciniju.<sup>334</sup> Međutim, zbog male bikonične glavice, ali i izvedbe cijele koncepcije ukrasa one se i potpuno udaljuju od garičkog primjerka i mogu biti samo neka daljnja reminiscencija (sl. 39).

Pored nje zabilježena je vremenski mlađa i dimenzijama nešto manja igla s profiliranim, izrazito naglašenim vratom, lijevana u kalupu i dorađena žlijebljenjem, varijanta igala opredijeljenih tipom *Velika Gorica* (kat. 156, sl. 40: 12; 45).<sup>335</sup> Riječ je o regionalnom tipu koji se izrađivao, koristio i optjecao na prostoru od jugoistočnoalpskog, tj. preko ruškog, dobovskog do kvarnerskog kulturnog kruga u vrijeme HaB1 stupnja, odnosno u IV. fazi KPŽ sjeverozapadne Hrvatske, kada su se, razvidno, izdvojile i pojedine mjesne varijante.

Iz predloženog se vidi da se igle s tordiranim vratom kako u tipološkom tako i u kronološkom smislu, tj. u prostornim i kulturološkim odnosima bitno razlikuju (sl. 40; 44-45). No transparentna nadregionalna povezanost Kvarnera, posebno crikveničkog primorja i otoka Krka, s velikogoričkim i dobovskim, te posredno ruškim, kulturnim i stvaralačkim miljeom bila je znatna i stalna.<sup>336</sup>

U konceptu tzv. regionalizma i/ili lokalizma analizira se napokon i kombinacija s tada modernim narukvicama, jer utjecaje iz kultura KPŽ možemo donekle pratiti i u njihovom procesu proizvodnje. Naime, poželjnim se čini upravo zbog toga naglasiti, kako oštri rubovi žljebova garičke igle imaju po sebi ukras urezanih kosih crtica. Slijediti se može kod narebrenih manšetastih narukvica iz Osora, Garice i Šule (kat. 60, 164, 221-222), čime suptilno i neizravno sugeriraju na neki lokalni radionički "potpis".

Manšetaste narebrenene narukvice inače su redovit nalaz nakita na prostoru Kvarnera, rjeđe na priobalnom i češće na otočnom dijelu (sl. 46). Većina ih potječe iz starijih istraživanja (kat. 36, 49, 60-61, 164-165, 221-222) bez poznatih okolnosti nalaženja, pa osnovni oslonac u interpretaciji obilježavaju narukvice iz tumula u Šuli i iz tumula u Stolnič (kat. 49, 221-222, 2-3). Manji ulomak iz Godača iznad Crikvenice sporadični je nalaz (kat. 9), pored novijeg nalaza s područja sjeverne

into the 12<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>329</sup> The pin from Osor is corroded and on the neck is clearly visible a combination of decorative lines which must have been present, as seen from several incised lines below the head. On the contrary, the horizontal shallow grooves on its head are more explicitly visible – three of them are placed in the lower and three in the upper part. The pin from Nin<sup>330</sup> supports the above – it has a similar grooved head, a thickening on the neck decorated with several outer parallel lines on the outer thickened part and hatched linked rhomboids on the inner thickened part. Considering the shape and decoration of the oval thickened neck, the pin from Krneza-Duševićeva Glavica, whose discovery circumstances are unclear, could be brought closer to them.<sup>331</sup> The geometric decoration of straight and oblique lines running from the neck across the thickening is incised. The head is onion-shaped but completely smooth without any traces of decoration – distinguishing itself thus as a specific variant of the theme from the pins of Osor and Nin. On the other hand, the pins from Biljane Donje and Varvara also differ due to the shape of their head and the moderate thickening of the neck as well as the reduced decoration – they might represent a common, older variant.<sup>332</sup>

Since all the pins lack a clear context of discovery that would provide a support for a precise dating, the stylistic and typological characteristics can only point in the direction of dating into HaA and into the framework of the broadly applied fashion of large pins with onion-shaped heads. This could be supported by the discovery of the pin from Nin, which was found together with an imported fibula with two double profiled knobs on the bow (fig. 18), allowing once again associations with the inventories of costumes from Kvarner sites (fig. 42).

In the further analysis of materials one more pin with an onion-shaped head must be mentioned, which, unfortunately, comes from the necropolis in Garica. It was smaller and massively cast with an emphasized and densely twisted neck which was divided from the head by a thickening of a square cross-section (cat. 155, fig. 40: 11).<sup>333</sup>

<sup>334</sup> Carancini 1975: 209, T. 48: 1473-1475.

<sup>335</sup> Ljubić 1876: 28, T. III: 21. Za Veliku Goricu vidjeti nova razmatranja S. Karavanić (2009: 57-71). Crtež igle, osobito glavice, razlikuje se od prethodno objavljenih (Karavanić 2009: Pl. 54: 2). Usp. Blečić Kavur 2011: 58-59, Fig. 9: 10; Fig. 10-11.

<sup>336</sup> Blečić Kavur 2011: 58-59; Blečić Kavur 2012b: 218-219.


<sup>329</sup> Carancini 1975: 191-192, 194, T. 43: 1313-1321, T. 107G; comp. Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 104: 19-21.

<sup>330</sup> Unpublished, Museum of Nin antiquities, Nin.

<sup>331</sup> Gusar, Vujević 2012: 111, Sl. 7, T. V: 1.

<sup>332</sup> Some authors think that these are pins from the Middle Bronze Age which was the base for the dating of the pin from Osor (Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 498).

<sup>333</sup> Ljubić 1876: 28, T. III: 20.



**Slika 43.** Inventar groba 25/V iz nekropole u Nezakciju (prema Mihovilić 2001a).

**Figure 43.** Inventory of grave 25/V from the necropolis of Nesactium (after Mihovilić 2001a).

Dalmacije iz tumula Krneze-Duševića Glavica (?) (sl. 46).<sup>337</sup>

U tipološkom aspektu, mišljenja po kojima se mogu kronološki vršiti distinkcije između pojedinih varijanti manšetastih narukvica,<sup>338</sup> po čemu bi one ravnih rubova (varijante I) trebale biti nešto starije od rubova s cjevasto uvijenim krajevima (varijante II) (sl. 46), nisu zaživjela. Upravo su grobovi iz Vrsi (sl. 26) i Privlake, kao i Vranjica, svjedočili da su one barem dijelom istovremene.<sup>339</sup> Obje varijante tih narukvica na Kvarneru poznate su jedino iz Garice (kat. 165-166, sl. 46), uz dominaciju onih varijante I s ravnim krajevima. Iz istarskih nalazišta, gdje su također kvantitativno prisutne, obje varijante znane su samo iz nezakcijske nekropole i ubrojene su u oblike I. faze starijeg željeznog doba Istre.<sup>340</sup> Iako su načelno paralelizirane s kasnim brončanim dobom liburnske skupine, praktički je istarski materijal tog ranog stupnja dobrim dijelom datiran s osloncem na grobnu cjelinu 1982/33 iz Dobove.<sup>341</sup> Međutim, taj grob obilježava I. fazu pokopavanja na dobovskoj nekropoli gdje je ulomak manšetaste narukvice vremenski uspoređen s datacijom narukvica u zatvorenim grobnim cjelinama na području istočne obale Jadrana. Dakle, primaknut je dataciji fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku te iglama s lukovičastom glavicom i tordiranim vratom,<sup>342</sup> a kakva je napokon poznata i iz Nezakcija! Zatim, manšetaste su narukvice nezaobilazni inventar ostava, te su pr. u ostavi iz Brodskog Varoša prisutne obje varijante tih narukvica, a sukladno dataciji igle s bikoničnom, na vrhu spljoštenom i kaneliranom glavicom, smještene su u vrijeme

Closer comparisons to this pin are not known, although we should note that regarding the basic form and decoration it exhibits a certain amount of similarity to the pins mentioned above from which it most probably derives. However, the basic difference between them is the thickening with a square cross-section – a characteristic which is by no means a workshop specific or chronological feature. With its massive form and elaboration of the thickened twisted neck it is similar to the above mentioned pins from the Ljubljana River, Dobova and even Škocjan. Some similar features, based on obviously common ideas, are exhibited on pins with a profiled thickening on the twisted and slightly thickened necks, which are known, unfortunately without exact contexts, from the territory of the Friuli plain and which were dated to BF according to G. L. Carancini.<sup>334</sup> However, due to their little byconical heads and the overall conception of decoration they differ entirely from the Garica example, and could be only a distant reminiscence of a similar form (fig. 39).

Also a second, chronologically younger and much smaller pin was discovered in Garica. It has an extremely emphasized neck – the pin itself was cast in a mold and later completed by grooving. We can consider it to be a variant of the pins described as the Velika Gorica type (cat. 156, fig. 40: 12; 45).<sup>335</sup> It is a regional type which was made, used and circulated on the territory from the south-eastern Alpine area, i.e. the territory of the Ruše and Dobova groups, to the Kvarner cultural circle in the period of the HaB1 phase, i.e. in the IV<sup>th</sup> phase of the Urnfield culture of north-western Croatia when several local variants were formed.

Based on the presented data, it is visible that the pins with a twisted neck differ significantly in their typological and chronological sense,

<sup>337</sup> Gusar, Vujević 2012: T. V: 2-4.

<sup>338</sup> Čović 1965: 61; Čović 1971a: 79; Mihovilić 1972: 46.

<sup>339</sup> Glogović 1989: 33.


<sup>340</sup> U grobu podno gradine Sv. Martin na Limskom kanalu nalazio se ulomke narebrenne manšetaste narukvice i ogrlica od tankih koštanih perli (Mihovilić et al. 2002: 32: 1).

<sup>341</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 56-57.

<sup>342</sup> Teržan 1995: 339, Abb. 27.

<sup>334</sup> Carancini 1975: 209, T. 48: 1473-1475.

<sup>335</sup> Ljubić 1876: 28, T. III: 21. For Velika Gorica see a new discussion by S. Karavanić (2009: 57-71). Drawing of the pin, particularly the head is different from previously publications (Karavanić 2009: Pl. 54: 2). Comp. Blečić Kavrur 2011: 58-59, Fig. 9: 10; Fig. 10-11.



**Slika 44.** Karta rasprostranjenosti igala tipa Marco (▲) (nadopunjeno prema Blečić Kavur 2011) (Lista 8).

**Figure 44.** Distribution map of pins of Marco type (▲) (supplemented after Blečić Kavur 2011) (List 8).

**Slika 45.** Karta rasprostranjenosti igala tipa Velika Gorica (■) i varijante (★) (prema Blečić Kavur 2011) (Lista 8).

**Figure 45.** Distribution map of pins of Velika Gorica type (■) and variant (★) (after Blečić Kavur 2011) (List 8).

HaA1 stupnja.<sup>343</sup> Ista je situacija donekle određena i za jugoistočno-alpski prostor. U velikim su ostavama miješanog sastava najvećim dijelom dokumentirane fragmentirane i definirane u vrijeme II. horizonta prema P. Turku,<sup>344</sup> odnosno u cijeli stupanj HaA, što predstavljaju nalazi iz ostava Čremožiše i Jurke Vasi.<sup>345</sup>

Narukvice iz tumula u Stolnič (kat. 2-3, sl. 19) predstavljaju iznimne primjerke jer su uz rubove ukrašene nizom šrafiranih trokuta, odnosno uz krajeve šrafiranom cik-cak trakom. Do sada takav ukras nije poznat na manšetastim narukvicama obrađivanog prostora, ali je zato sličan znan na manšetastoj narukvici ravnih krajeva iz Siponta, Masseria Cupola grob Ia, datirane u kasno brončano doba i također uspoređivane s liburnskim primjercima (sl. 44).<sup>346</sup> Ipak, nešto neizrazitiji ukras urezanih kosih crtica po rebrima, kako je navedeno, poznat je s narukvica iz Osora i iz Šule. Ove potonje bile su uspoređene s nakitom iz Glasinca<sup>347</sup> i, razvidno se može povezati s narukvicom iz Garice (kat. 164). Međutim, novijim su istraživanjima zabilježene i kod dva primjerka iz bogate ostave Chiusa di Pesio u okolici Cunea na prostoru južnog Pijemonta, koje se osobito približuju po principu izvedbe ukrasa grupe kosih linija i crtica na vanjskim rubovima narukvica.<sup>348</sup>

<sup>343</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: T. 55: 26; T. 57: 15, T. 59: 35; Clausning 2003: Abb. 55: 415, 416; Abb. 56: 419.

<sup>344</sup> Turk 1996: 108-110.

<sup>345</sup> Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 145, T. 48: 67; 201, T. 91: 34. Isto vrijedi i za nalaz manšetastih narukvica u velikoj ostavi miješanog sastava koja potječe iz Gorjancev, Gorenji Suhadol, na Dolenjskoj i koja je preliminarno datirana u HaA stupanj (Križ, Stipančić 2007: 61-62). U ostavi iznimno dugog trajanja Peggau u austrijskoj Štajerskoj datirana je takva narukvica u vrijeme HaA2/B1 horizonta (Weihs 2004: 70-71, T. 7: 76).

<sup>346</sup> De Julis 1979: 527, Fig. 6: 2. R. Peroni ih općenito na italjskom kopnu smješta u kasnu fazu BF (Peroni 1989: 97, Abb. 30,20; usp. Della Casa 1996: 150 nagovara k nižoj kronološkoj poziciji).

<sup>347</sup> Glogović 1989: 33. Ukras malih urezanih crtica na rebrima nakita ne može biti kronološki oslonac i hipotetički pristup višoj dataciji, budući da je iznimno čest dekorativni element na različitim predmetima (npr. na lijevanoj narebrenoj ploči iz ostave Debeli vrh ili na različitim tipovima srpova...).

<sup>348</sup> Rubat Borel 2009: 66-68, Fig. 48, 1-2. Autor opširno raspravlja o svim paralelama na europskom prostoru, uključujući i one iz istočnog Jadrana. Usp. Blečić Kavur 2012b.

i.e. in their spatial and cultural relations (fig. 40; 44-45). However, the transparent supraregional connection of the Kvarner, in particular of the area around Crikvenica and the island of Krk, with the creative environment of Velika Gorica and Dobova, and indirectly also with the Ruše cultural groups, was considerable and constant.<sup>336</sup>

Within the concept of the so called regionalisms and/or localisms also the combination with the then popular bracelets is analysed, since the influences of the Urnfield culture may be followed up to a certain degree in their process of production. It appears thus desirable to point out the fact that the sharp edges of grooves of the Garica pin bear also the decorations of incised lines. Such a decoration could be followed on the ribbed cuff-shaped bracelets from Osor, Garica and Šula (cat. 60, 164, 221-222) which suggest in a subtle and indirect way a specific local workshop "signature".

Ribbed cuff-shaped bracelets are also a recurrent find on the territory of Kvarner, appearing frequently on the islands and seldom on the coastal area (fig. 46). Since the majority of them derives from old excavations without any known details on the context of their discovery (cat. 36, 49, 60-61, 164-165, 221-222), the interpretation will focus on the finds from the tumuli in Šula and from the tumulus in Stolnič (cat. 49, 221-222, 2-3). A similar find from Godač above Crikvenica is a sporadic one (cat. 9), whereas among the new finds an example from the tumulus in Krneza-Duževića Glavica(?) on the territory of northern Dalmatia should be mentioned (fig. 46).<sup>337</sup>


Attempts to distinguish them chronologically based on their typology were never successful – several authors suggested that those with straight ends (variant I) should be older than those having rolled up ends (variant II).<sup>338</sup> The graves from Vrsi (fig. 26), Privlaka and Vranjic proved that they were at least partly contemporary.<sup>339</sup> Both variants are known on the territory of Kvarner only from Garica (cat. 165-166, fig. 46). In Istria, where they are also a common find, both variants appear only on the necropolis of Nesactium, where they are

<sup>336</sup> Blečić Kavur 2011: 58-59; Blečić Kavur 2012b: 218-219.

<sup>337</sup> Gusar, Vujević 2012: T. V: 2-4.

<sup>338</sup> Čović 1965: 61; Čović 1971a: 79; Mihovilić 1972: 46.

<sup>339</sup> Glogović 1989: 33.



**Slika 46.** Karta rasprostranjenosti manšetastih narebrenih narukvica varijante I (ravnih ●) i varijante II (uvijenih ■) krajeva, na području jugoistočnog alpskog prostora, sjevernog Jadrana i Dalmacije (Lista 9).

**Figure 46.** Distribution map of the ribbed cuff-shaped bracelet; variant I (with straight ends ●) and variant II (with rolled up ends ■), on the territory of south-eastern Alpine region, north Adriatic and Dalmatia (List 9).

Prema svemu, stolnički su nalazi ishodišnim podrijetlom iznimno isprepleteni i stoga kulturološki posebno vrijedni. Još jednom potvrđuju povezanost manšetastih narukvica s lučnim fibulama sa dva dugmeta na luku i s iglom s tordiranim vratom, a koji se mogu naći u žari oblika kanelirane šalice. Tom idejom i djelom svjedoče kako kronološki osjetljivijih razlika između sjevernojadranskih (kvarnerski i istarskih) te manšetastih narukvica iz KPŽ sjeverozapadne Hrvatske nije moguće razlučiti,<sup>349</sup> odnosno kako njihovu primjenu možemo pratiti već od HaA stupnjeva.

Rijetku pojavu u nošnji ne predstavlja niti nalaz manšetastih narukvica zajedno s narukvicama dvoslivnog presjeka, što dobro ilustrira inventar groba iz Vrsi<sup>350</sup> (sl. 26) ili onaj iz groba 15 nekropole Limske gradine,<sup>351</sup> pa čak i iz groba VI/15 iz Nezakcija.<sup>352</sup> Treba se svakako prisjetiti i inventara groba 14 nekropole Salapie, koji uz lučnu fibulu sadrži upravo narukvicu dvoslivnog presjeka i manšetastu narebrenu narukvicu s uvijenim krajevima (sl. 48), nakit koji je toliko tipičan za istočnu obalu Jadrana, prije svega za istovremeno liburnsko područje<sup>353</sup> (sl. 42; 46; 49).

Narukvice dvoslivnog presjeka (kat. 14, 25, 37-40, 51-52, 136-139, 176) i trakaste narukvice C ili bubrežastog presjeka (kat. 62-71, 140-141), na obalnom se području afirmiraju za vrijeme kraja II. i

included into the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the Early Iron Age of Istria.<sup>340</sup> Despite the fact that these finds are compared to the Late Bronze Age period of the Liburnian group, the material from Istria is dated on the basis of the Dobova grave 1982/33.<sup>341</sup> However, the given grave, in which a fragment of a ribbed cuff-like bracelet was discovered, belongs to the I. phase of burials on the necropolis. Consequently, the bracelets should be compared to the finds from closed contexts on the eastern Adriatic coast and thus belonging to the period of fibulae with two knobs on the bow and pins with an onion-shaped head and a twisted neck<sup>342</sup> - the same forms known also from Nesactium! On the other hand, the ribbed cuff-like bracelets are an integral part of hoards and both variants can be found in hoards such as the Brodski Varoš one, which was dated into HaA1, based on the dating of a pin with a byconical head flattened and horizontally grooved on the top.<sup>343</sup> The same situation can be observed in the east Alpine region - mostly fragmented pieces were discovered in the big hoards of mixed inventory dated to the II<sup>nd</sup> phase according to P. Turk<sup>344</sup> or the whole period of HaA, which is supported by the finds from the hoards of Čremožiše and Jurka Vas.<sup>345</sup>

The bracelets from the tumulus in Stolnič (cat. 2-3, fig. 19) are exceptional in terms of their decoration - the edges are decorated with hatched triangles and the ends with a hatched zigzag band. No similarly decorated examples are known so far from the area of research but a similar find comes from Siponto, Masseria Cupola grave Ia, where they are dated into the Late Bronze Age and paralleled with the Liburnian finds (fig. 44).<sup>346</sup> Another, not so clearly elaborated, decoration of lines on the ribs is known from the bracelets of Osor and Šula. The latter were compared with the finds from Glasinac<sup>347</sup> and with a bracelet from Garica (cat. 164). However, during recent research, they were noticed on two examples from the rich hoard of Chiusa di Pesio in the surroundings of Cuneo on the territory of southern Piedmont, which seem to be particularly closely related with respect to the decorating principle applied in the form of oblique lines and short lines on the bracelets' outer edges.<sup>348</sup>

Taking into consideration the aforementioned, the Stolnič finds show once again the close connection of the ribbed cuff-shaped bracelets and bowed fibulae with two knobs on the bow, as well as pins with a twisted neck, which can be found in cup-shaped urns with oblique grooves. Consequently, these connections demonstrate that it is not

<sup>340</sup> In a grave below the hill-fort of Sv. Martin in the Lim channel fragments of a cuff-shaped bracelet and a necklace of thin bone beads were discovered (Mihovilić et al. 2002: 32: 1).

<sup>341</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 56-57.

<sup>342</sup> Teržan 1995: 339, Abb. 27.

<sup>343</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: T. 55: 26; T. 57: 15, T. 59: 35; Clausen 2003: Abb. 55: 415, 416; Abb. 56: 419.

<sup>344</sup> Turk 1996: 108-110.

<sup>345</sup> Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 145, T. 48: 67; 201, T. 91: 34. The same holds for the discovery of cuff-shaped bracelets in the large depot of mixed composition from Gorjanci, Gorenji Suhadol, in Dolenjska which was preliminary dated in to HaA (Križ, Stipančić 2007: 61-62). In the depot with a long period of deposition in Peggau in Austrian Styria such a bracelet was dated in to HaA2/B1 (Weihs 2004: 70-71, T. 7: 76).

<sup>346</sup> De Juliis 1979: 527, Fig. 6: 2. R. Peroni dates them on the Italian territory in to a late phase of BF (Peroni 1989: 97, Abb. 30, 20; compare also Della Casa 1996: 150 which addresses a lower chronological position).

<sup>347</sup> Glogović 1989: 33. The decoration of small incised lines on the ribs of jewelry cannot be a chronological base and a hypothetical argument for an older dating since they are a frequent decoration on different artifacts (for example on a cast ribbed plate from the hoard of Debeli vrh or on different types of sickles...).

<sup>348</sup> Rubat Borel 2009: 66-68, Fig. 48, 1-2. The author discusses in details all comparisons on European territory, including the ones from the territory of the eastern Adriatic. Comp. Blečić Kavr 2012b.


<sup>349</sup> Nižu dataciju istarskih i liburnskih narukvica, u odnosu na one iz sjeverne Hrvatske predlagala je D. Glogović (1989: 33). Međutim, s obzirom na pojedine okolnosti nalaženja, a kao kronološki manje osjetljivi nakitni oblici mogu se šire smjestiti u vrijeme čitavog stupnja HaA i mlađeg HaB.

<sup>350</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIV: 1-14.

<sup>351</sup> Mihovilić 1972: T. 8: 5-12, 22.

<sup>352</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: T. 31: 7-8; T. 47: 16-17; T. 63: 1-9.

<sup>353</sup> De Juliis 1979: 523, Fig. 5a.



**Slika 47.** Sipont, Masseria Cupola, inventar groba 1 (prema De Juliis 1979).

**Figure 47.** Sipont, Masseria Cupola, inventory of the grave 1 (after De Juliis 1979).

tijekom III. faze KPŽ sjeverne Hrvatske i Podunavlja.<sup>354</sup> Relativno su brojno zastupljene na području Kvarnera pa će tako obilježavati jedan od omiljenijih nakitnih oblika (sl. 49).<sup>355</sup> Narukvice dvoslivnog presjeka najvećim su dijelom sačuvane kao pojedinačni nalazi i/ili često namjerno polomljene. Veći broj poznat je samo iz Grižana (kat. 176)<sup>356</sup> te iz "rekonstruiranog groba" iz Baške, s prije opisanom nakitnom garniturom (kat. 14; sl. 20).<sup>357</sup> Najbliže i najvažnije paralele kvarnerskim primjercima nalaze se na istarskom poluotoku, posebno dobro datirane na nekropoli Limske gradine<sup>358</sup> i u Nezakciju (sl. 30; 43), gdje ih je također uobičajeno mnogo i namjerno polomljenih.<sup>359</sup> Budući da su ondje dovedene u prisniju vezu s utjecajima iz kruga KPŽ, vremenski su određene trajanjem kroz 11. i 10. stoljeće.<sup>360</sup> Njihovo uvođenje u modu područja Istre sinkronizirano je s istim razvitkom na prostoru sjeverne i srednje Dalmacije, gdje se, naime, ne pojavljuju u mlađim horizontima, pa je uvriježeno da su se otuda prenijele i na italsko kopno, zastupljene osobito na prostoru Daunije (sl. 47-48).<sup>361</sup> Međutim, na istarskim su nekropolama nedjeljivo povezane uz žare tipa kanelirane šalice, s pretpostavkom da su prispjele istovremeno i zajednički,<sup>362</sup> što posredno sugerira

<sup>354</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 72-74; usp. Karavanić 2009.

<sup>355</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: T. 23: 6; Glogović 1989: 33, T. 36: 37: 1-2, 4; Glogović 1991: T. 2: 1-4.

<sup>356</sup> Glogović 1989: T. 36.

<sup>357</sup> Mader 2006: Abb. 18.


<sup>358</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 45, T. 5: 12; 10: 9, 10; 11: 18; 27: 17-22.

<sup>359</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 55, 76, T. 72-76; 41: 3-18.

<sup>360</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 45-47; Gatti, Petitti 1980: 148; Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987: 302.

<sup>361</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 72-74; Batović 1973: 64; Batović 1980: 33, T. 12: 14; 13: 15; 16: 10; Batović 1983: 311, 329-340, Sl. 20: 15; 21: 12; T. 43: 3-6; 44: 1-6; 45: 2; Tine Bertocchi 1975: 278, T. 71: 1-3; De Juliis 1979: Fig. 5a.

<sup>362</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 45-46, T. 26, 30...; Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 72-73; Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987: 302-303, T. 10; Mihovilić 1997: 45, T. 7-8; Mihovilić 2001a: 55,



**Slika 48.** Nakitna garnitura iz groba 14 nekropole u Salapiji (prema De Juliis 1979).

**Figure 48.** Jewelry and attire from grave 14 from Salapia (after De Juliis 1979).

possible to make a distinction in more subtle chronological terms between ribbed cuff-shaped bracelets from northern Adriatic sites, from the Kvarner and Istria, and those from the sites of the Urnfield culture of continental Croatia<sup>349</sup> – we can actually follow their use from the HaA phase onwards.

Also a common find is the combination of a bracelet with a double-pitch cross-section and a ribbed cuff-shaped bracelet, which nicely illustrate the inventory of the grave from Vrsi<sup>350</sup> (fig. 26) or grave 15 from the necropolis on Limska Gradina<sup>351</sup> and even the grave VI/15 from Nesactium.<sup>352</sup> Of course, we have to keep in mind also grave number 14 from Salapia in which together with a bow fibula a bracelet with a double-pitch cross-section and a ribbed cuff-shaped bracelet with rolled up ends is found – an inventory typical of the eastern Adriatic coast, in particular of the Liburnian territory of that period<sup>353</sup> (fig. 42; 46; 49).

The bracelets with a double-pitch cross-section (cat. 14, 25, 37-40, 51-52, 136-139, 176) and band-shaped bracelets with a C formed cross-section or a kidney-shaped cross-section (cat. 62-71, 140-141), are present on the coastal area and are typical of the II<sup>nd</sup> and the III<sup>rd</sup> phase of the Urnfield Culture in northern Croatia and the Danube basin.<sup>354</sup> They are relatively numerous on the territory of Kvarner, where they represent one of the favorite forms of jewelry (fig. 49),<sup>355</sup> mostly known as stray finds, and often most probably deliberately broken. A larger number of them are known from Grižane (cat. 176)<sup>356</sup> and from the "reconstructed grave" of Baška (cat. 14; fig. 20).<sup>357</sup> The largest number and most important comparisons can be observed on Istrian sites, where they are very well dated on the necropoles of Limska Gradina<sup>358</sup> and Nesactium (fig. 30; 43), where they were very numerous and often deliberately fragmented.<sup>359</sup> Since they were linked to the influences of the Urnfield culture, they were chronologically dated to the 11<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>360</sup> and their

<sup>349</sup> A younger dating of the Istrian and Liburnian bracelets in regards to those from northern Croatia was proposed by D. Glogović (1989: 33). But regarding the circumstances of discoveries as well as the fact that some forms of jewelry are chronological less sensitive they could be dated in to the whole period of HaA and the older part of HaB.

<sup>350</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIV: 1-14.

<sup>351</sup> Mihovilić 1972: T. 8: 5-12, 22.

<sup>352</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: T. 31: 7-8; T. 47: 16-17; T. 63: 1-9.

<sup>353</sup> De Juliis 1979: 523, Fig. 5a.

<sup>354</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 72-74; comp. Karavanić 2009.

<sup>355</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: T. 23: 6; Glogović 1989: 33, T. 36: 37: 1-2, 4; Glogović 1991: T. 2: 1-4.


<sup>356</sup> Glogović 1989: T. 36.

<sup>357</sup> Mader 2006: Abb. 18.

<sup>358</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 45, T. 5: 12; 10: 9, 10; 11: 18; 27: 17-22.

<sup>359</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 55, 76, T. 72-76; 41: 3-18.

<sup>360</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 45-47; Gatti, Petitti 1980: 148; Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987: 302.



**Slika 49.** Karta rasprostranjenosti narukvica dvoslivnog presjeka na području sjevernog Jadrana i Dalmacije (nadopunjeno prema Batović 1960; Glogović 1989) (Lista 10).

**Figure 49.** Distribution map of bracelet with a double-pitch cross-section on the territory of north Adriatic and Dalmatia (supplemented after Batović 1960; Glogović 1989) (List 10).

nešto višu dataciju od uobičajene, a argumentiraju je upravo nalazi iz Grižana i Vrsi.

Neposrednu povezanost sa žarama oblika kanelirane šalice obilježavate, dakle narukvice, i dvoslivnog presjeka i manšetaste, što svjedoči inventar i stolničkog tumula (kat. 5-7).<sup>363</sup> Pored šalice u grobu je, na najdubljoj razini, nađen i drugi poveći ulomak žare trbušastog tijela s visoko postavljenom trakastom ručkom koja spaja vrat i rame posude (kat. 8, sl. 19). U žari su se nalazili paljevin-ski ostaci dviju individua kako je rečeno, odraslog muškarca i djeteta. S obzirom na oblikovne karakteristike mogla bi se pridružiti u skupinu najstarijih tzv. žara s blago ukošenim koničnim vratom tipa A prema Michaeli Lochner,<sup>364</sup> i s obzirom da je rub izvučen, lagano facetiran bez dodatnih ukrasa. Srodnosti našoj urni nisu brojne, ali ih možemo izdvojiti u grupi Zagreb, Vrapče grob 5 ili Novigrad Podravski<sup>365</sup> gdje su, temeljem analogija iz nekropole Baierdorf, smještene u stupanj HaA. Trakasta ručka urne ima pak vrlo bliske analogije kod posuda na području rane ljubljanske kulture, SAZU grob 191,<sup>366</sup> i Ljubljana, Turjaška palača D65, D69.<sup>367</sup> Na obližnjem području sjevernoga Jadrana i/ili zaleđa posude opisanih obilježja nisu za sada ustanovljene, pa datacija prema navedenim usporedbama ostaje dobro primjenjiva sveukupnom inventaru stolničkog groba (HaA1/A2).

Sl. 45, T. 42, 43, 45, 46, 50.

<sup>363</sup> Starac 2004: 183; Blečić 2009: Fig. 1; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 6: 5-7; Blečić Kavur 2012b: Sl. 2: 5-7.

<sup>364</sup> Lochner 1991: 271: TypA.

<sup>365</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1983: 580, T. LXXXVIII: 2, 7.

<sup>366</sup> Puš 1971: 56, T. 33: 5.

<sup>367</sup> Horvat 2002: 59, D65, D69.

appearance on the territory of the northern Adriatic was concurrent with the same process on the territory of northern and central Dalmatia, where they do not appear in younger contexts. Therefore, it is assumed that it was from there that their production was transferred to the Italian ground, where they are numerous, in particular on the territory of Daunia (fig. 47-48).<sup>361</sup> However, on the necropolises of Istria they are indivisibly linked to the urns with grooved decoration and consequently it was assumed that both elements were introduced together and at the same time,<sup>362</sup> suggesting a higher dating than habitually assumed, which is supported by the finds of Grižane and Vrsi.

Direct connections with the urns in the form of a grooved cup are provided by bracelets – those with a double-pitch cross-section and cuff-shaped ones, as shown by the inventory of the tumulus from Stolnić (cat. 5-7).<sup>363</sup> Beside the cup, located on the lowest level, a second larger fragment of a belly-shaped urn was discovered in the Stolnić tumulus, displaying a high positioned band-shaped handle linking the shoulder of the vessel to the neck (cat. 8, fig. 19). Inside the urn the cremated remains of two individuals were found: that of an adult male and of a child. With regard to its formal characteristics, the urn could be included into the group of the oldest, the so called urns with a slightly inclined conical neck of the A type according to the typology by Michaela Lochner.<sup>364</sup> Comparisons are not numerous but could be observed in the Zagreb group, in grave 5 from Vrapče, or in Novigrad Podravski<sup>365</sup> where, based on the analogies to the necropolis of Baierdorf, such urns were dated into the HaA phase. The band-shaped handle has very close analogies to vessels from the early Ljubljana culture – in the graves 191 from SAZU<sup>366</sup> and D65, D69 from Turjaška palača.<sup>367</sup> Since no such vessels have been discovered yet on the neighboring territory of the northern Adriatic and/or its hinterland, the dating of comparable material (HaA1/A2) may be applied to the total inventory of the Stolnić grave.

The fragments of grooved pottery, regardless of their form and function, have become a common find. Apart from the tumulus in Stolnić, they were also found at the necropolis Crekvina near Kastav (cat. 102, fig. 50)<sup>368</sup> and Kaštel in Bakar.<sup>369</sup> These vessels are cup-shaped with a narrower cylindrical neck and a handle elevated above the edge of the vessel, exhibiting obliquely grooved decoration on the shoulders. In the neighboring areas and well-dated they were found in Vaganačka pećina in Podvelebitsko primorje,<sup>370</sup> in Podosojna peć (fig. 52) above Mošćenička Draga<sup>371</sup> and, based on a single find, also in Pupičina peć.<sup>372</sup> The cremation burials in such urns were documented also on the necropolis of the Šapjane hill-fort<sup>373</sup>, whose material is mostly unpublished. Such an urn was presumably discovered in the destroyed tumulus on the hillside of the hill-fort

<sup>361</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 72-74; Batović 1973: 64; Batović 1980: 33, T. 12: 14; 13: 15; 16: 10; Batović 1983: 311, 329-340, Sl. 20: 15; 21: 12; T. 43: 3-6; 44: 1-6; 45: 2; Tine Bertocchi 1975: 278, T. 71: 1-3; De Julis 1979: Fig. 5a.

<sup>362</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 45-46, T. 26, 30...; Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 72-73; Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987: 302-303, T. 10; Mihovilić 1997: 45, T. 7-8; Mihovilić 2001a: 55, Sl. 45, T. 42, 43, 45, 46, 50.

<sup>363</sup> Starac 2004: 183; Blečić 2009: Fig. 1; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 6: 5-7; Blečić Kavur 2012b: Sl. 2: 5-7.

<sup>364</sup> Lochner 1991: 271: TypA.

<sup>365</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1983: 580, T. LXXXVIII: 2, 7.

<sup>366</sup> Puš 1971: 56, T. 33: 5.

<sup>367</sup> Horvat 2002: 59, D65, D69.

<sup>368</sup> Blečić 2002: 77-78, Sl. 3.

<sup>369</sup> Starac 2005: 166, Sl. 8.


<sup>370</sup> Forenbaher, Vranjican 1985: 13-15, T. 7: 12, T. 9: 3.

<sup>371</sup> Starac 1994: 22, Prilog XI: 9.

<sup>372</sup> Forenbaher, Kaiser 2006: 188, T. 5.9: 4.

<sup>373</sup> Battaglia 1927: 113-115; Matejčić 1983: 50; Starac 1996: 7-8.





**Slika 50.** Ulomak kanelirane šalice i široke zdjele s urezanim i kaneliranim ukrasom iz Crekvine na Kastvu (prema Blečić 2002; Starac 1991).

**Figure 50.** Fragment of a grooved cup and a broad bowl with incised and grooved ornaments from Crekvina on Kastav (after Blečić 2002; Starac 1991).

No ulomci žare tipa kanelirane šalice ipak su sada već učestaliji nalaz, bez obzira na njihovu namjenu. Tako, pored tumula u Stolničju, potječu još iz nekropole Crekvine kod Kastva (kat. 102, sl. 50)<sup>368</sup> te iz Kaštela u Bakru.<sup>369</sup> Riječ je o žarama oblika zaobljeno trbušaste šalice, suženog niskog cilindričnog vrata i s ručkom podignutom iznad ruba posude, koso kaneliranog ukrasa na izvučenim ramenima. Na obližnjem području dobro datirane nalazimo ih još u Vaganačkoj pećini u podvelebitskom primorju,<sup>370</sup> u Podosojnoj peći (sl. 52) iznad Mošćeničke Drage,<sup>371</sup> a samo ulomci jedne posude takvog tipa potječu iz Pupićine peći.<sup>372</sup> No pokopavanje na isti način i u opisanim žarama sigurno je zabilježeno i na nekropoli gradine Šapjane,<sup>373</sup> čija je materijalna građa najvećim dijelom neobjavljena. Takva je žara bila nađena, navodno, i u uništenom tumulu na obronku gradine Veli Kaslir kod Punta na Krku.<sup>374</sup> Žare istih obilježja učestale su, međutim, kod istarskih nekropola i njihove I. ili najstarije faze pokopavanja. Uz to se vrijeme povezuje uvođenje obreda spaljivanja pokojnika koje je vremenski konvencionalno usklađeno s prijelazom klasičnog Ha A2/B1 stupnja.<sup>375</sup>

O posebnim nalazima, staklene perle i saltaleona iz Podosojne peći već je bilo riječi. Keramički inventar koji je povezan uz iste, tj. kasnobrončanodobne slojeve ističe se karakterističnim oblicima tzv. gradinske keramike šire sjevernojadranske regije koja je u literaturi već bila komentirana.<sup>376</sup> Međutim, u oba se kasnobrončanodobna sloja (tzv. horizont B2 i B1) nalaze i keramički oblici koje možemo dovesti u priskupnu vezu sa širim kontinentalnim prostorom. Ponajprije se to odnosi na nalaz šalice s izdignutom ručkom (kat. 106, sl. 52) kojoj gotovo identične paralele postoje u gradivu iz ličke špilje Bezdanjača.<sup>377</sup> Zatim slijede ulomci istog oblika šalice s trakastim ručkama, obogaćeni ukrasom plitko žlijebljenih paralelnih i girlandnih linija (kat. 107-108, sl. 52), za koje pak najbolje analogije vidimo kod istarskih nekropola osobito Limske gradine i Nezakcija (sl. 30: 2),<sup>378</sup> te posebno kod nalaza iz špilja; ličke Bez-

Veli Kaslir near Punat on Krk.<sup>374</sup> Urns with similar characteristics are numerous also on necropolis in Istria where they are dated into the oldest, 1st phase of inhumations, marking the introduction of cremation burials – conventionally correlated with the cross point of the classical phase HaA2/B1.<sup>375</sup>

Special finds of glass beads and saltaleoni from Podosojna peć have already been discussed. The ceramic inventory related to the Late Bronze Age layers is characterized by the presence of forms of the so called "castelieri" or "gradina" pottery of the northern-Adriatic region, which was already discussed in the literature.<sup>376</sup> However, in both Late Bronze Age layers (the so called horizons B2 and B1) pottery forms were discovered which could be linked to the continental area. First of all, these are cups with an elevated handle (cat. 106, fig. 52) which have almost identical comparisons in the finds from the cave Bezdanjača in Lika.<sup>377</sup> In addition, there were fragments of cups of the same form with band-shaped handles decorated with shallow grooved parallel and garland-shaped lines (cat. 107-108, fig. 52), which have best comparisons in the pottery from the necropolis in Istria – in particular on Limska Gradina and Nesactium (fig. 30: 2).<sup>378</sup> Further comparisons could be observed in cave sites dated to the HaA phase – the Bezdanjača from Lika, Predjama from Notranjska and Laganiši in Istria.<sup>379</sup> In terms of morphology, such type of pottery is typical of the broader territory of *Caput Adriae* preserving a strong tradition from the Middle Bronze Age.<sup>380</sup>

Their predecessors could be observed on the famous Bronze Age sites such as Vrčín,<sup>381</sup> Gradac-Turan,<sup>382</sup> Monkodonja,<sup>383</sup> Dvigrad and Elleri.<sup>384</sup> Stylistically, with the decoration of oblique grooves, also this pottery point at changes and the introduction of novelties which

<sup>368</sup> Blečić 2002: 77-78, Sl. 3.

<sup>369</sup> Starac 2005: 166, Sl. 8.

<sup>370</sup> Forenbaher, Vranjican 1985: 13-15, T. 7: 12, T. 9: 3.

<sup>371</sup> Starac 1994: 22, Prilog XI: 9.

<sup>372</sup> Forenbaher, Kaiser 2006: 188, T. 5.9: 4.

<sup>373</sup> Battaglia 1927: 113-115; Matejčić 1983: 50; Starac 1996: 7-8.

<sup>374</sup> Starac 2004: 170.

<sup>375</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 43-46, Sl. 5; Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987: 300-304, T. 30; Mihovilić 2001a: 39, 49-67.

<sup>376</sup> Starac 1991; Starac 1994; Mihovilić 2001: 49-50; Mihovilić 2008: 52.

<sup>377</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1980: T. XXVI: 6; T. XXXII: 1.

<sup>378</sup> Mihovilić 1972: T. 11: 1; T. 18: 1; T. 25: 1; T. 26: 2 itd; Mihovilić 2001a: T. 44: 1, 22,

<sup>374</sup> Starac 2004: 170.

<sup>375</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 43-46, Sl. 5; Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987: 300-304, T. 30; Mihovilić 2001a: 39, 49-67.

<sup>376</sup> Starac 1991; Starac 1994; Mihovilić 2001a: 49-50; Mihovilić 2008: 52.

<sup>377</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1980: T. XXVI: 6; T. XXXII: 1.

<sup>378</sup> Mihovilić 1972: T. 11: 1; T. 18: 1; T. 25: 1; T. 26: 2 etc; Mihovilić 2001a: T. 44: 1, 22, 39; T. 50: 1; T. 82: 1 etc; Mihovilić 2013: S. 70, Sl. 72.

<sup>379</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1980: T. VI: 9; T. XXXVIII: 2; T. XXXIX: 3; Korošec 1989: T. 1: 3; Mihovilić 2008: 52.

<sup>380</sup> Cardarelli 1983: 92, 154, T. 17; Urban 1993: 152, 166, 250; Mihovilić 2001a: 46, 49.

<sup>381</sup> Buršić-Matijašić 1997: 118, T. 12.

<sup>382</sup> Mihovilić 1997: 43-45, T. 3: 4, 5.


<sup>383</sup> Buršić-Matijašić 1998: 81-83, T. 31; Hänsel, Mihovilić, Teržan 1999: 87-89, 91, 93, Sl. 39, 43, 46.

<sup>384</sup> Lonza 1981: T. 4, T. 5.

danjače, notranjske Predjame te istarske Laganiši,<sup>379</sup> svi datirani u HaA stupanj. Morfološki, takav je tip posude karakterističan za šire područje *Caput Adriae* s jakom tradicijom iz srednjeg brončanog doba.<sup>380</sup> Njihove preteče nalazimo na poznatim brončanodobnim nalazištima Vrčin,<sup>381</sup> Gradac-Turan,<sup>382</sup> Monkodonja,<sup>383</sup> Dvigrad i Elleri.<sup>384</sup> Stilski pak, načinom ukrašavanja kosim kanelurama ili žlijebljenjem, i ta keramika upućuje na promjene i uvođenje noviteta koji se vjerojatno koncentriraju i filtriraju kroz utjecaje koje je K. Vinski-Gasparini pripisivala grupi Zagreb, i iz prostranog kruga KPŽ sjeverne Hrvatske II. i tijekom III. faze,<sup>385</sup> mada je karakteristična pojava i pri ukrašavanju keramičkog asortimana čitavog područja Veneta upravo za BF1 već od 12. stoljeća.<sup>386</sup>

Istome vremenskom okviru može se pribrojiti i nalaz prilično jednostavne igle male, pločaste glave oblika čavla i neukrašenog vrata (kat. 118, sl. 51), koja je kao jedini metalni nalaz nađena zajedno s navedenim keramičkim inventarom iz Kaštela u Bakru.<sup>387</sup> Prostorna i kulturna interpretacija tog tipa igala ponajprije je povezana uz Karpatsku kotlinu, a dobro su zastupljene od srpskog Podunavlja, južne Bačke i Srijema pa sve do Slavonije.<sup>388</sup> S obzirom na okolnosti njihova nalaženja, uglavnom naselja i nekropola, rjeđe ostava, datirane su od BrD do HaA1 stupnja, posebice virovitičke kulturne grupe,<sup>389</sup> što u okosnici odgovara i nalazima iz bakarskog Kaštela. Italske igle s glavom u obliku čavla razlikuju se od opisanih te su mlađe, mahom smještene, zahvaljujući dobro datiranim kontekstima, općenito u stupanj BF s mogućnošću trajanja pojedinih varijanti sve do PF1.<sup>390</sup>

U kulturama istočnog Jadrana rasprostiranje kaneliranih šalice usko se povezivalo uz narukvice dvoslivnog presjeka, i kako je već rečeno, osim u Istri bile su dovedene u vezu s kasnom fazom brončanog doba ili s tzv. *prijelaznom fazom* iz brončanog u željezno doba Liburnije.<sup>391</sup> S obzirom na ovdje iznesene podatke, naročito u odnosu na nalaze iz Podosojne peći, tumula u Stolnič i bakarskog Kaštela, te *nota bene* istarskih nekropola, s izdvojenim primjerom groba 19 nekropole Limske gradine, predmetne posude moramo shvaćati već u HaA horizontu, povezane uz mjesne tradicije i uz dotok utjecaja iz ličkog zaleđa, osobito Bezdanjače,<sup>392</sup> budući da upravo u Podosojnoj izostaju mlađe, tzv. kanelirane šalice, a zatupljene su starije varijante bez ukrasa ili s urezanim, tj. žlijebljenim linijama (sl. 49), čime se zapravo revidira i njihovo dosadašnje prenisko datira-



Slika 51. Igla s malom glavicom oblika čavla iz Bakra, Kaštel.

Figure 51. Pin with a small nail shaped head from Bakar, Kaštel.

were concentrated and filtered through the influences attributed by K. Vinski-Gasparini to the Zagreb group - a part of the vast cultural circle of the Urnfield culture of Northern Croatia during the II<sup>nd</sup> and III<sup>rd</sup> phase,<sup>385</sup> although, by observing the neighboring regions, it becomes obvious that these decorations are a characteristic phenomenon of the whole pottery assortment on the Veneto territory exactly in BF1 already in the 12<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>386</sup>

The discovery of a relatively small and simple pin with a flat, nail-shaped head (cat. 118, fig. 51) may be included into the same chronological framework, being the only metal item discovered with the discussed pottery in Kaštel in Bakar.<sup>387</sup> The spatial and cultural interpretation of these pins is first of all linked to the Carpathian basin, but they are numerous in the Serbian Danube Region, in southern Bačka, in the Srijem and all the way to Slavonia.<sup>388</sup> Their contexts of discovery, mostly settlements and necropoles, rarely hoards, especially of the Virovitica cultural group,<sup>389</sup> were dated from BrD to HaA1 which roughly corresponds to the finds of the Bakar Kaštel. Italian pins with nail-shaped heads differ from those described and are younger – due to the well dated contexts they are dated into BF with a possibility of duration of individual variants to PF1.<sup>390</sup>

The distribution of grooved cups in eastern Adriatic cultures was closely related to bracelets with a double-pitched cross section, which were linked, as already mentioned, apart from Istria, to the late phase of the Bronze Age, or to the so called transitional phase from the Bronze into the Iron Age of Liburnia.<sup>391</sup> With regard to the presented data, especially in relation to the finds from Podosojna peć the tumulus in Stolnič and Bakar Kaštel, as well as *nota bene* Istrian the necropoles led by grave 19 from the Limska Gradina necropolis, the discussed vessels have to be dated into the HaA horizon and

39; T. 50: 1; T. 82: 1 itd; Mihovilić 2013: S. 70, Sl. 72.

<sup>379</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1980: T. VI: 9; T. XXXVIII: 2; T. XXXIX: 3; Korošec 1989: T. 1: 3; Mihovilić 2008: 52.

<sup>380</sup> Cardarelli 1983: 92, 154, T. 17; Urban 1993: 152, 166, 250; Mihovilić 2001a: 46, 49.

<sup>381</sup> Buršić-Matijašić 1997: 118, T. 12.

<sup>382</sup> Mihovilić 1997: 43-45, T. 3: 4, 5.

<sup>383</sup> Buršić-Matijašić 1998: 81-83, T. 31; Hänsel, Mihovilić, Teržan 1999: 87-89, 91, 93, Sl. 39, 43, 46.

<sup>384</sup> Lonza 1981: T. 4, T. 5.

<sup>385</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 68-72, 125-131, 149; Vinski-Gasparini 1983: 566-580, T. 37: 6; T. 38: 8; T. 87; Peroni 1983: 65-67; Cardarelli 1983: T. 19; Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987: 303; Mihovilić 2008: 52; za tipologiju i dataciju u odnosu na Baierdorf-Velatice kulturni krug usp. Vrdoljak 1995: 20 35, T. 11: 1; T. 33: 2; tip šalice C6.

<sup>386</sup> Bianchin Citton 2009: 258-259, Fig. 1-2.

<sup>387</sup> Starac 2005: 166.

<sup>388</sup> Vasić 2003: 45-sa starijom literaturom.

<sup>389</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 85, 90; Vasić 2003: 44-45; Perkić, Ložnjak Dizdar 2005: 68, T. 6: 107.

<sup>390</sup> Carancini 1975: 229-231.

<sup>391</sup> Batović 1976: 20-30; Batović 1980: 39-41; Batović 1983: 302-304, 329-330, T. 43; 44; 45.

<sup>392</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1980: 37.

<sup>385</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 68-72, 125-131, 149; Vinski-Gasparini 1983: 566-580, T. 37: 6; T. 38: 8; T. 87; Peroni 1983: 65-67; Cardarelli 1983: T. 19; Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987: 303; Mihovilić 2008: 52; for typology and dating in relation to the Baierdorf-Velatice cultural circle comp. Vrdoljak 1995: 20 35, T. 11: 1; T. 33: 2; type C6.

<sup>386</sup> Bianchin Citton 2009: 258-259, Fig. 1-2.


<sup>387</sup> Starac 2005: 166.

<sup>388</sup> Vasić 2003: 45 – with older literature.


<sup>389</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 85, 90; Vasić 2003: 44-45; Perkić, Ložnjak Dizdar 2005: 68, T. 6: 107.

<sup>390</sup> Carancini 1975: 229-231.

<sup>391</sup> Batović 1976: 20-30; Batović 1980: 39-41; Batović 1983: 302-304, 329-330, T. 43; 44; 45.



Slika 52. Izbor građe iz kasnobrončanodobnih slojeva Podosojne peći (prema Starac 1988; Starac 1991; Starac 1994).



**Figure 52.** Selection of finds from the Late Bronze Age layers of Podosojna peč Cave (after Starac 1988; Starac 1991; Starac 1994).

nje u 11. i 10. stoljeće. Uostalom, takvu je kronološku poziciju za istarske primjerke predlagao već P. Della Casa,<sup>393</sup> a prihvatila je i K. Mihovilić.<sup>394</sup>

Zanimljivi su, naravno, i drugi keramički oblici iz Podosojne peći. Veliki lonac bikoničnog presjeka sa četiri utisnuta ispupčenja, s ukrasnom horizontalnom trakom ukrašenom ubodima koja teče sredinom tijela,<sup>395</sup> slijedi također starije tradicije iz srednjeg brončanog doba. Zatim, na većim, bikonično zaobljenim posudama kojima oblik nije u cijelosti poznat, u pravilu konkavno uvijenog vrata, izdvojeno je karakteristično ukrašavanje horizontalnih i kružnih usporednih snopova kanelura i/ili žljebova uokolo kružnog ispupčenja, stvarajući pri tomu određene linearne geometrijske motive: cik-cak, trokute, koncentrične kružnice i sl.<sup>396</sup> Najčešće su to bikonične posude, cilindričnog ali kratkog vrata (kat. 109-112, sl. 52). Srodnosti za njih nalazimo na čitavoj kvarnerskoj regiji istraživanih gradina: Kastav, Gradina iznad Šapjana, Čelo kod Jadranova, Crni Vrh iznad Bakarskog zaljeva, gradine Osap kod Novog Vinodolskog, Sv. Juraj kod Bribira,<sup>397</sup> s otoka Krka na gradini Veli Kaslir kod Punta ili na gradini Kostriļ kod Vrbnika (kat. 212-213, 215-219), zatim s gradine Polanža kod Čunskog na Lošinju<sup>398</sup> itd. Sa zapadne strane, uz istočnu obalu Istre također nalazimo isti tip keramike od Podosojne peći, preko gradine Gračišće kod Sv. Jelene, Boligrad kod Zagorja, Gradac na Sisolu ili gradine Gradac kod Grabrove (Mošćenička Draga),<sup>399</sup> pa dalje do gradine Kunci<sup>400</sup> i Gradca-Turana kod Koromačnog.<sup>401</sup> Posebno značenje pripada naravno keramici toga tipa iz špilje Laganiši.<sup>402</sup> Oblikovno i ukrasno takvi se tipovi keramike mogu pratiti na čitavom sjevernojadranskom području od Istre i Kvarnera preko zaleđa od Krasa i Like do sjeverne Dalmacije i njezina zaleđa.<sup>403</sup> Riječ je o keramičkim oblicima specifičnog ukrasa čija se primjena počinje uporabljati već u srednje brončano doba, ali su u Istri datirani dobrim dijelom i u kraj srednjeg brončanog te u kasno brončano doba I. faze,<sup>404</sup> što će se u pravilu odnositi i na nalaze s Kvarnera. S takvim okolnostima, posebno mjesto zauzet će ulomak koničnog dna posude na nozi iz Kostriļja (kat. 219), s unutrašnje strane ukrašenog kružnim ispupčenjem s kanelurama u sredini i s ravnomjerno postavljenim ispupčenjima sa strana, a koji je već bio uspoređen sa srodnim keramičkim ulomcima iz Nina i Varvare.<sup>405</sup> Isto se odnosi i na nalaze dvije pekve iz Podosojne peći (kat. 117) koje nisu čest, ali nisu niti rijedak nalaz u kulturama istočnojadranskih obala, pa ih poznajemo iz Nezakcija, no češće su na prostoru Picena i Terni, gdje su interpretirane kroz utjecaje KPŽ na Italiju.<sup>406</sup>

Napokon, u ovom keramičkom ekskursu, predstavljaju se i zdjele. U osnovnim crtama također nastavljaju starije tradicije iz srednjeg brončanog doba, a povezuju se također uz utjecaje iz prostora KPŽ. Najčešće su to široke plitke zdjele razgrnutog a zadebljanog

linked to local traditions and the influences from the Lika territory, which can be observed in particular in the finds from Bezdanjača.<sup>392</sup> In fact, it is in Podosojna peć that the younger, so called grooved cups are missing, while older variants without decoration or with incised or fluted lines are present (fig. 49), whereby their chronology and their too early dating into the 11<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries has actually been revised. Such a dating for Istrian examples was already suggested by Ph. Della Casa,<sup>393</sup> and accepted by K. Mihovilić.<sup>394</sup>

Other pottery forms from Podosojna peć are also interesting. The large byconical pot with four appliques impressed in the centre and a horizontal band, decorated with stitches running in the center of the body,<sup>395</sup> also follows older traditions of the Middle Bronze Age. In addition, on larger, rounded and byconically shaped pots, whose form could not be completely reconstructed, but generally with a concave neck, characteristic decorations in the form of horizontal sheaves of parallel grooves as well as circles of them running around warts, can be singled out and creating geometrical motives – zigzag, triangles, concentric circles and similar forms.<sup>396</sup> These were mostly byconical pots with a cylindrical or a short neck (cat. 109-112, fig. 52). Their parallels can be observed on all excavated hill-forts in the region of Kvarner – on Kastav, Gradina above Šapjane, Čelo near Jadranovo, Crni Vrh above the bay of Bakar, Osap near Novi Vinodolski, Sv. Juraj near Bribir<sup>397</sup> and from Veli Kaslir near Punat and Kostriļ near Vrbnik on the island of Krk (cat. 212-213, 215-219) and Polanža near Čunski on Lošinju<sup>398</sup> and many others. On the western side, following the coast of Istria, we can observe the same style of pottery from cave Podosojna peć, the hill-fort of Gračišće near Sv. Jelena, Boligrad near Zagorje, Gradac on Sisol and Gradac near Grabrova (Mošćenička Draga),<sup>399</sup> and further to Kunci<sup>400</sup> and Gradac-Turan near Koromačno<sup>401</sup> etc. Particular importance is given to the pottery of this type from the Laganiši cave.<sup>402</sup> These forms and decoration of pottery can be followed on the whole territory of the northern Adriatic from Istria and Kvarner, across their hinterlands to Kras and Lika and all the way to Dalmatia and its hinterland.<sup>403</sup> These are pottery forms with specific decorations which started being used already in the Middle Bronze Age and they were dated in Istria to the end of the Middle and the Late Bronze Age of the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of Istrian group<sup>404</sup> which could be, generally, used also for the sites in Kvarner. Under such circumstances the fragment of a conical bottom of a vessel on a foot from Kostriļ deserves a special place (cat. 219). It is decorated on the inner side with a circular wart with concentric grooves in the middle and with regularly positioned warts on the sides. This piece was already compared to pottery fragments from Nin and Varvara.<sup>405</sup> Also special are the finds of two baking lids from Podosojna peć (cat. 117) which were not a common, but also not a very rare find in the cultures of the eastern Adriatic – they were known from Nesactium. However, they are more numerous on the

<sup>393</sup> Della Casa 1996: 151.

<sup>394</sup> Mihovilić 2008: 52; Mihovilić 2012: 414, 416; Mihovilić 2013: 114, 116.

<sup>395</sup> Starac 1991: Sl. 2: 6.

<sup>396</sup> Starac 1994: 22.

<sup>397</sup> Starac 1994: 17; Starac 2004: 194, T. IV.

<sup>398</sup> Cardarelli 1983: 106, T. 26: 10-11.

<sup>399</sup> Starac 1994: 16-17.

<sup>400</sup> Kos 2005, T. II: 5-6.

<sup>401</sup> Mihovilić 1997, 44-45, T. 6.

<sup>402</sup> Mihovilić 2008: 49-50.

<sup>403</sup> Starac 2004: 194; usp. Batović 1970; Cardarelli 1983: 96, 100; Čović 1978; Glogović 1989: 36.

<sup>404</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 43; Mihovilić 1997: 44; Mihovilić 2001a: 46; Mihovilić 2008: 49-50, 55.

<sup>405</sup> Glogović 1989: 36, T. 47: 10.

<sup>406</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 67; Mihovilić 2001a: 48, T. 102: 1; 103: 1; Pare 1998: 26: 49.

<sup>392</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1980: 37.

<sup>393</sup> Della Casa 1996: 151.

<sup>394</sup> Mihovilić 2008: 52; Mihovilić 2012: 414, 416; Mihovilić 2013: 114, 116.

<sup>395</sup> Starac 1991: Sl. 2: 6.

<sup>396</sup> Starac 1994: 22.

<sup>397</sup> Starac 1994: 17; Starac 2004: 194, T. IV.

<sup>398</sup> Cardarelli 1983: 106, T. 26: 10-11.

<sup>399</sup> Starac 1994: 16-17.

<sup>400</sup> Kos 2005, T. II: 5-6.

<sup>401</sup> Mihovilić 1997: 44-45, T. 6.

<sup>402</sup> Mihovilić 2008: 49-50.

<sup>403</sup> Starac 2004: 194; comp. Batović 1970; Cardarelli 1983: 96, 100; Čović 1978; Glogović 1989: 36.

<sup>404</sup> Mihovilić 1972: 43; Mihovilić 1997: 44; Mihovilić 2001a: 46; Mihovilić 2008: 49-50, 55.

<sup>405</sup> Glogović 1989: 36, T. 47: 10.

rubu i zaobljenog trbuha (kat. 113-114). Rub je često facetiran, sa ili bez kanelura, uz primjenu koso, prema dolje okrenutih masivnih ručki. Nalaze se na širem prostoru čitavog sjevernog Jadrana od srednjeg do u kasno brončano doba.<sup>407</sup> Izuzev u Podosojnoj peći, gdje su nađene u oba brončanodobna horizonta špilje (B2-B1), nalazimo ih na Kastvu (Crekvina) (kat. 103, sl. 50), Kostrilju (kat. 209-211, 218), Sv. Jurju kod Bribira<sup>408</sup> kao i u Vaganačkoj peći,<sup>409</sup> pa se i s tim oblicima pokušalo tumačiti ili učvrstiti slijed prodiranja utjecaja iz panonsko-podunavske KPŽ osobito iz virovitičkog kulturnog kruga i grupe Zagreb, koji je preko Like<sup>410</sup> dopirao na sjeverni Jadran,<sup>411</sup> s dakle izrazitom manifestacijom upravo na Kvarneru.

Loptaste posude uvučenog ruba i zaobljenog ramena s dvostrukim, u različitim motivima apliciranim ukrasnim trakama poznata je samo jednim ulomkom iz Kostrilja (kat. 206), a donekle je češći nalaz na području istarskih nalazišta.<sup>412</sup> Za lonce izvučenog ili koso položenog kratkog ruba, kao i za velike lonce zaobljenog trbuha s horizontalno postavljenim ručkama mnogokutnog ili trakastog presjeka (kat. 115) paralele možemo vidjeti na širokom području njihova rasprostiranja od istočne Slovenije i sjeverozapadne Hrvatske preko Like do Istre.<sup>413</sup>

Izrazite utjecaje KPŽ, kako je pokazano, možemo pratiti u elementima ženske, ponajviše bogatije i istaknutije nošnje, zatim pri određenim simboličkim i estetskim predmetima, te vrlo dobro na keramografskoj distribuciji čitavog prostora sjevernog Jadrana. U tome neće biti pošteđeni niti elementi koje najčešće tumačimo u izrazito muškom počelu. Isto se zrcali u primjeni određene vrste oruđa i oružja. To su manje ili više objavljeni nalazi u stručnoj literaturi, uz pridodane im pojedine nove primjerke. Budući da na području Kvarnera predstavljaju rijetke predmete, tretirani su u klasi prestiža, shvaćajući to kao realni odraz tadašnjeg stanja ili subjektivno, tj. trenutačno kao odraz stanja (ne)istraženosti. Najbrojnije su sjekire, podijeljene u dva tipa sa svojim varijantama, te vrhovi koplja, također tipološki podijeljenima.

Sjekire sa zaliscima zastupljene su sa dva primjerka, od kojih je onaj iz Vrbnika izrazito fragmentiran i dostupan samo iz stare objave C. Marchesetti (kat. 17, sl. 54).<sup>414</sup> Riječ je o ulomku tijela s više podignutim zaliscima, oštećenog ali zaobljenog tjemena, što doista ne ostavlja dovoljno prostora za poblizu tipološku klasifikaciju. Ipak, ukoliko bolje promotrimo crtež, vidljivo je da se zalisci spuštaju izravno iz tjemena, koje je najvjerojatnije bilo prilično zatvoreno s malom rupicom, i da su oni relativno kratko savinuti. S tim značajkama ne čini se pogrešnim sjekiru približiti uz veliku nadregionalnu i vrlo učestalu grupu sjekira tipa Haidach prema F. Mayeru.<sup>415</sup> One su svojstvene prijelazu iz starije u mlađu fazu KPŽ, a prema građi iz jugoistočnoalpskog zaleđa i šireg alpskog prostora tretirane su unutar II. horizonta ostava prema P. Turku.<sup>416</sup> Kako bilo, bio je to prvi objavljeni nalaz sjekire sa zaliscima s prostora Kvarnera i jedan od rijetkih na sjevernome Jadranu.

Potpuno drugačiju priliku nalazimo kod sjekire sa zaliscima iz Griža-

territory of Picenum and Terni where they were interpreted through the influence of the Urnfield culture on Italy.<sup>406</sup>

Finally, this presentation of pottery will focus on bowls. In their basic forms bowls continue the formal traditions of the Middle Bronze Age, but could also be linked to the traditions coming from the territory of the Urnfield culture. Bowls are mostly broad and shallow, with a thickened and everted rim and a rounded belly (cat. 113-114). The rim is often faceted, with or without grooves and below it vertical massive handles are attached. Such bowls were discovered on the whole territory of the northern Adriatic from the Middle and into the Late Bronze Age.<sup>407</sup> Apart from Podosojna peć, where they were found in both Bronze Age horizons (B2 and B1), they were discovered on Kastav (Crekvina) (cat. 103, fig. 50), Kostrilj (cat. 209-211, 218), Sv. Juraj near Bribir<sup>408</sup> and in Vaganačka peć.<sup>409</sup> These forms were used in the attempt to interpret and preserve the sequence of the penetration of influences by the Pannonian-Danubian Urnfield culture, especially by the Virovitica cultural circle and the Zagreb group, which were present in Lika,<sup>410</sup> the northern Adriatic<sup>411</sup> and, in particular, on the Kvarner territory.

Circular vessels with an inverted rim and a rounded shoulder decorated with double applied ribs with different motives are known only from a single fragment from Kostrilj (cat. 206), but are a more common find on Istrian sites.<sup>412</sup> More general forms such as pots with everted short rims, as well as large globular pots with a rounded belly and horizontally placed handles of multifaceted or a band like cross-section (cat. 115) can be followed on a wide area stretching from eastern Slovenia and north-western Croatia across Lika, all the way to Istria.<sup>413</sup>

Clear influences of the Urnfield culture may be followed in elements of female, mostly richer and more prominent attire, in certain objects of symbolic and aesthetic value and, as mentioned above, on the pottery of the whole northern Adriatic area. Of course, these influences did not circumvent such elements most commonly interpreted as belonging exclusively to men, i.e. the use of specific forms of tools and weapons. These finds, mostly published in the scientific literature and provided with single new examples, due to their scarcity on the territory of Kvarner were discussed as prestigious items which could be a result of a real state in the past or just our subjective position which is a reflection of the current state of research in the field. Most numerous are axes, divided into two types with their variants, and spear points also typologically divided.

There are two finds of winged axes, with the one from Vrbnik being particularly fragmented and known only from the old publication by C. Marchesetti (cat. 17, fig. 54).<sup>414</sup> This is a fragment of a body with highly elevated wings and with a damaged but rounded butt, whose poor level of preservation does not allow for a more precise typological classification. However, if it is analysed more into detail, it can be observed, that the wings arise directly from the butt, which must have been relatively closed and with a small opening. If we take this into consideration, it does not seem incorrect to attribute the axe to

<sup>407</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 43; usp. Cardarelli 1983: 100, T. 20: 176, 20A; Bellintani 1992.

<sup>408</sup> Starac 2004.

<sup>409</sup> Forenbaher, Vranjican 1985: 13, T. 11: 2-4.

<sup>410</sup> Usp. Golubnjača i Bezdanjača.

<sup>411</sup> Forenbaher, Vranjican 1985: 13-14; usp. Batović 1980: 43.

<sup>412</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: T. 93: 2, 5, 6...

<sup>413</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1980: T. XI: 6-7; T. XVIII: 9; Vrdoljak 1995: T. 36: 5; Mihovilić 2008: 49.

<sup>414</sup> Marchesetti 1903: T. 11: 12; Batović 1980: T. 6: 9; Žeravica 1993: 73, T. 20: 249A.

<sup>415</sup> Mayer 1977: 152-157.

<sup>416</sup> Turk 1996: 108.

<sup>406</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 67; Mihovilić 2001a: 48, T. 102: 1; 103: 1; Pare 1998: 26: 49.

<sup>407</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 43; comp. Cardarelli 1983: 100, T. 20: 176, 20A; Bellintani 1992.

<sup>408</sup> Starac 2004.

<sup>409</sup> Forenbaher, Vranjican 1985: 13, T. 11: 2-4.


<sup>410</sup> Comp. Golubnjača and Bezdanjača.

<sup>411</sup> Forenbaher, Vranjican 1985: 13-14; comp. Batović 1980: 43.

<sup>412</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: T. 93: 2, 5, 6...

<sup>413</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1980: T. XI: 6-7; T. XVIII: 9; Vrdoljak 1995: T. 36: 5; Mihovilić 2008: 49.

<sup>414</sup> Marchesetti 1903: T. 11: 12; Batović 1980: T. 6: 9; Žeravica 1993: 73, T. 20: 249A.



**Slika 53.** Karta rasprostranjenosti tuljastih sjekira sa tri točke unutar rebrastog "Y" ornamenta (nadopunjeno prema Teržan 1996; König 2004a) (Lista 11).

**Figure 53.** Distribution map of socketed axes with the decoration of three circles in the ribbed "Y" ornament (supplemented after Teržan 1996; König 2004a) (List 11).

na (kat. 173).<sup>417</sup> Izrazito vitka, u potpunosti očuvana sjekira glatkog je gornjeg dijela tijela s kratkim zaliscima te podignutog presjeka, ravnog tjemena i stepenastog prijelaza u sječivo. Temeljem opisanih obilježja Zdenko Žeravica ju je opredijelio u malobrojni tip Guntramsdorf, definirajući ju u kategoriji oružja.<sup>418</sup> Sjekire toga tipa raspoređene su uglavnom od Donje Austrije do Transilvanije,<sup>419</sup> ali grizanski se primjerak povezuje uz jugoistočnoalpski prostor starije faze KPŽ iz kojeg najvjerojatnije i potječe, s dobrom analogijom kod sjekire iz ostave Črmošnjice.<sup>420</sup> Doduše, kod te su sjekire zalisci malo duži te presjek stoga srednje izvučen. Prilično srodan primjerak potječe istočnije iz ličkog Bužima, a kao nešto udaljenije varijante navode se sjekire iz bosanskih nalazišta Babin Potok i Barlovci.<sup>421</sup> Međutim, valja im pribrojiti i sjekiru iz špilje Bezdanjača<sup>422</sup> koja je, iako objavljena, ostala po strani u navedenim studijama.

Treća sjekira potječe iz Osora (kat. 98, sl. 41),<sup>423</sup> i pripada drugome tipu, odnosno tzv. tuljastim sjekirama. Ubraja se u red onih bez

the large and numerous groups of axes of the Haidach type according to F. Mayer.<sup>415</sup> They were characteristic for the period of transition from the older into the younger Urnfield culture, and according to the finds from the south-eastern alpine hinterlands and the broader Alpine area, they were numerous in the II<sup>nd</sup> horizon of hoards according to P. Turk.<sup>416</sup> In any case this was the first published example of a winged axe from the territory of Kvarner and one of the few on the northern Adriatic.

A completely different situation is found in the winged axe from Grižane (cat. 173),<sup>417</sup> which is extremely slender and completely preserved displaying a smooth upper part of the body, short wings and an elevated cross-section, a flat butt and a step-like transition into the blade. Due to its characteristics, Zdenko Žeravica included it into the few numbered type Guntramsdorf and defined it to be a weapon.<sup>418</sup> Axes of this type are distributed mostly on the territory between Lower Austria and Transylvania,<sup>419</sup> while the find from Grižane presents a connection to the south-eastern Alpine territory of the older Urnfield culture, where it most probably also comes from, offering a good comparison to the axe from the Črmošnjice hoard.<sup>420</sup> Still, this axe displays slightly longer wings and a mid-section drawn. Another comparable find comes from Bužim in Lika, whereas the axes from the Bosnian sites of Babin Potok and Barlovci were located slightly more to the east.<sup>421</sup> In addition, we have to add the axe from Bezdanjača cave,<sup>422</sup> which, although published, remained unnoticed in the listed studies.

The third axe comes from Osor (cat. 98, fig. 41),<sup>423</sup> and belongs to the second type, i.e. to the so called shaft hole axes, and more precisely, the axes without a loop, with a thickened mouth and a "Y" – shaped ornament. According to the Z. Žeravica typology, the axe was included into group 4 of such axes, which are dated into the HaA period.<sup>424</sup> By comprising this axe to the finds from north-western Croatian hoards, or to axes from south-eastern Alpine hoards from Slovenia, dated into the II<sup>nd</sup> horizon according to K. Vinski-Gasparini, a similar dating was proposed also by J. Čus-Rukonić and D. Glogović linking this isolated find to the influences of the Urnfield culture on the given territories.<sup>425</sup> Indeed, most matching parallels can be found in the II<sup>nd</sup> horizon of hoards according to P. Turk,<sup>426</sup> with closest examples in the hoards of Čremožiše<sup>427</sup> and Gorenji Log near Litija<sup>428</sup> on one side, and in the hoard of Dabar near Seget on the other.<sup>429</sup> It is exactly axes of that

<sup>417</sup> Žeravica 1993: T. 18: 226.

<sup>418</sup> Žeravica 1993: 68.

<sup>419</sup> Mayer 1977: 124-125.

<sup>420</sup> Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 149, T. 51: 1.

<sup>421</sup> Žeravica 1993: 68, T. 18: 223-225; Gavranović 2011/I: 129, Abb. 129.

<sup>422</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1980: T. XXVI: 1.

<sup>423</sup> Batović 1980: T. VII: 11; Čus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 4: 1; Žeravica 1993: T. 36: 489; Batović 2003: Sl. 4: 1. Pri sjekiri su uočene razlike različitih objavljivača. Tako Š. Batović prikazuje samo jedno kružno ispupčenje unutar "Y" ornamenta, što potom prenosi i Z. Žeravica, dok se kod J. Čus-Rukonić i D. Glogović nalaze tri ispupčenja složena u trokut koji prati smjer rebara.

<sup>415</sup> Mayer 1977: 152-157.

<sup>416</sup> Turk 1996: 108.

<sup>417</sup> Žeravica 1993: T. 18: 226.

<sup>418</sup> Žeravica 1993: 68.

<sup>419</sup> Mayer 1977: 124-125.

<sup>420</sup> Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 149, T. 51: 1.

<sup>421</sup> Žeravica 1993: 68, T. 18: 223-225; Gavranović 2011/I: 129, Abb. 129.

<sup>422</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1980: T. XXVI: 1.

<sup>423</sup> Batović 1980: T. VII: 11; Čus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 4: 1; Žeravica 1993: T. 36: 489; Batović 2003: Sl. 4: 1. The illustrations of the axe exhibit differences in different publications. Š. Batović depicts only a single circular wart inside the "Y" shaped ornament, the same depiction is reproduced by Z. Žeravica, while J. Čus-Rukonić and D. Glogović find three warts organized in a triangular form which follows the direction of the ribs.

<sup>424</sup> Žeravica 1993: 95, 99.


<sup>425</sup> Čus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 497-498; they determine the decoration as "Y" shaped ribs.

<sup>426</sup> Turk 1996: 108-112.

<sup>427</sup> Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 139, T. 43: 9.

<sup>428</sup> Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 170, T. 69: 2.

<sup>429</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIX: 7; Čus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 497; In older literature it is listed as hoard from Marina near Trogir, as for example in Hansen 1992: Abb. 105: 14; König 2004: 41-42, 176, Abb. 84; comp. Teržan 1996: 247, f.n. 23. Z. Žeravica published it as the "unknown site" from the vicinity of Split (Žeravica 1993: 95, T. 36: 488).



**Slika 54.** Vrh koplja iz Krka, Sv. Fuska (kat. 16), i ulomak tijela sjekire sa zaliscima iz Vrbnika (kat. 17) (prema Marchesetti 1903). Vrhovi koplja iz Podbadnja (kat. 119) i Oporovine (kat. 120).

**Figure 54.** Spearpoint from Krk, Sv. Fuska (cat. 16) and a fragment of a winged axe from Vrbnik (cat. 17) (after Marchesetti 1903). Spearpoints from Podbadanj (cat. 119) and Oporovina (cat. 120).

ušice, zadebljanog ruba, ukrašenima sa "Y" ornamentom. Prema Z. Žeravici pribrojena je u varijantu 4 istoimenih sjekira, uključena u prostrani trend razdoblja HaA stupnja.<sup>424</sup> Sličnu dataciju, uspoređujući sjekiru s nalazima iz ostava sjeverozapadne Hrvatske ili sa sjekirama iz jugoistočnoalpskih ostava Slovenije, tj. uz II. horizont ostava prema K. Vinski-Gasparini, ponudile su i J. Ćus-Rukonić i D. Glogović, povezujući taj usamljeni primjerak upravo uz utjecaje KPŽ navedenih prostora.<sup>425</sup> Uistinu, najviše odgovarajućih paralela možemo naći u ostavama II. horizonta prema P. Turku,<sup>426</sup> s bliskim primjerkom u ostavi Čremožiše<sup>427</sup> i Gorenjem Logu pri Litiji,<sup>428</sup> kao i, s druge strane, kod sjekire iz ostave Dabar kod Segeta.<sup>429</sup> Sjekire tog načina ili stila ukrašavanja upravo su i izdvojene kao jugoistočnoalpska osobitost, tj. svojevrsan lokalizam u vremenu snažne dominacije panonsko-karpatškog metalurškog kruga, razlikovane u čak dvije varijante (sl. 53).<sup>430</sup> Naime, osorski primjerak tuljaste sjekire pripisan je brojnijoj 2. varijanti i valja ga stoga shvaćati u interakciji s tim područjem alpskog zaleđa, čime samo produbljuje pitanje poznavanja međudnosa s kontinentalnim KPŽ vidljive i kod ovakvih predmeta materijalne kulture.<sup>431</sup>

<sup>424</sup> Žeravica 1993: 95, 99.

<sup>425</sup> Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 497-498; Ukrašenosti određuju kao ornament "V" rebara.

<sup>426</sup> Turk 1996: 108-112.

<sup>427</sup> Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 139, T. 43: 9.

<sup>428</sup> Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 170, T. 69: 2.

<sup>429</sup> Batović 1983: T. XLIX: 7; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 497; U starijoj se literaturi navodi pod nazivom ostave Marina kod Trogira, kao npr. kod Hansen 1992: Abb. 105: 14; König 2004: 41-42, 176, Abb. 84; usp. Teržan 1996: 247, f.n. 23. Z. Žeravica je pak objavljuje pod nepoznato nalazište iz okolice Splita (Žeravica 1993: 95, T. 36: 488).

<sup>430</sup> Teržan 1996: 247, f.n. 23, Sl. 2; usp. i Hansen 1994: 179, 182-184, 398, Abb. 104; König 2004a: 41-42, izdvaja ih varijantom Budinščina ranih tuljastih sjekira s prelomljenim rebri.

<sup>431</sup> Nedavno objavljeni nalazi tri tuljaste sjekire (Buršić-Matijašić 2010), različitih tipoloških obilježja, nisu obrađeni u ovome radu, zato što njihovo nalaženje nije sigurno, ni po pitanju lokacije ni po pitanju vremena, što potvrđuje i tipološko vrednovanje prilično udaljenijih formi.

type and that form of decoration to be considered a south-eastern Alpine characteristic, a specific local form that existed in the period of distinctive dominance of the the Pannonian-Carpathian metallurgical circle (fig. 53),<sup>430</sup> and even 2 variants of such axes may be distinguished. For instance, the Osor find belongs to the second and more numerous variant and should be thus considered as a material reflection of the interaction with that territory of the Alpine hinterlands, deepening thereby the question concerning the knowledge of the mutual relations (as witnessed by such objects of material culture) with the continental Urnfield culture.<sup>431</sup>

On the other hand, spear points belong to the scarce category of military equipment on the Kvarner territory (fig. 54). All three examples lack the detailed circumstances of discovery, making their cultural and chronological understanding more difficult. Still, in the typological sense, they represent a certain pattern and an indicator that needs to be considered.

A pretty damaged spear point was discovered in the Oporovina cave above Medveja (cat. 120, fig. 54) stuck into a crack in the wall above the entry to the left secondary tunnel.<sup>432</sup> Taking into consideration the circumstances of its discovery, it could be interpreted as an individual, intentionally damaged and deposited artifact with a specific ritual meaning. According to its formal characteristics it could be included into the group of flame-shaped spearheads with

<sup>430</sup> Teržan 1996: 247, f.n. 23, Sl. 2; comp. and Hansen 1994: 179, 182-184, 398, Abb. 104; König 2004a: 41-42, separates the, as the variant Budinščina of the early socketed axes with broken ribs.

<sup>431</sup> Recently were published three socketed axes (Buršić-Matijašić 2010), with different typological characteristics which were not included in to the present discussion since their discovery is not reliable, nor its location nor the time. Doubts can be further supported by the fact that they belong to spatially distant forms.

<sup>432</sup> It was discovered during the excavations of R. Starac in 1988. Comp. Starac 1994. During the excavations in the cave were discovered layers demonstrating the use of the cave in the Late Bronze Age. Comp. Starac 1994; Komšo, Blečić 2007.



Vrhovi koplja spadaju u malobrojnu kategoriju nalaza vojne opreme na Kvarneru (sl. 54). Sva tri primjerka nemaju preciznije okolnosti nalaza, što dodatno otežava njihovo kulturno i kronološko razumijevanje. Ipak, u tipološkom smislu pokazuju određen uzorak i pokazatelj kojime ćemo morati raspolagati.

Vrh prilično oštećenog koplja iz špilje Oporovine iznad Medveje (kat. 120), nađen je pribijen u procijep špiljske stijene poviše ulaza u lijevi, sporedni kanal.<sup>432</sup> S obzirom na tu činjenicu, možda se može tumačiti kao pojedinačni, namjerno oštećen i ostavljen predmet određenog ritualiziranog značenja. Prema svojim obilježjima pripada tipu plamenastog oblika lista s cilindričnim tuljcem za nasad, profiliranog, stepenastog presjeka i tekućeg prijelaza iz lista u tuljac. Izgledno je, da je tuljac na listu lagano spljošten, što ga približava tipu L32 prema A. Bruno.<sup>433</sup> Takva, poglavito velika koplja, najčešće su bila ritualno i namjerno uništavana ili ostavljena, što nedvojbeno iskazuje i naš primjerak. Temeljem istoga može se povezati uz vrhove koplja starijeg vremena KŽP ili posebno HaA1 stupnja koji su se koristili na širokom europskom prostoru, osobito Karpatske kotline i alpskog zaleđa.<sup>434</sup>

Vrh koplja iz Sv. Fuske, iz uvale pored naselja Pinezići na zapadnoj obali otoka Krka, stari je nalaz, poznat isključivo iz crteža kojeg je objavio C. Marchesetti (kat. 16).<sup>435</sup> Zbog toga je također teže tipološki odrediti, ali po osnovnim se oblikovnim naznakama može dovesti u vezu s blago plamenastim vrhovima koplja srednje veličine, oštrog prijelaza lista u okrugli i izduženi tuljac za nasad. Težište lista postavljeno je nešto više, zbog čega se približava velikoj grupi IIA kopljastih vrhova koplja varijante tipa 3 prema A. Bruno.<sup>436</sup>

Treći vrh koplja potječe iz Podbadnja kod Crikvenice i navodno je pripadao ostavi od ukupno 13 vrhova koplja (kat. 119)?<sup>437</sup> Vrlo je dobro očuvan, pa se može ubrojiti u kategoriju malih vrhova lovorastog oblika lista, tekućeg prijelaza u široki okrugli tuljac. Težište lista je izrazito nisko, a sa strane se nalaze dvije rupice za pričvršćivanje i generalno se može pridružiti velikoj grupi IIB takvih koplja na prostoru nasuprotne Italije.<sup>438</sup>

Kao i vrh koplja iz Sv. Fuske, tako i opisani vrh koplja iz Podbadnja, pripadaju vrlo čestim nalazima na prostoru srednje Europe koje poznajemo iz različitih konteksta, i ostava i grobova, od najstarijih faza KPŽ pa sve do prijelaza na željezno doba,<sup>439</sup> zbog čega su kronološki manje osjetljivi predmeti, poglavito ako je riječ o osamljenim nalazima kao što je ovdje slučaj. Oni najčešće nisu ritualno tretirani, pa im se pridaje svakodnevna namjena, ponajprije lakih koplja za bacanje.

U vrijeme samoga kraja kasnog brončanog doba (ili početnog željeznog) pripadaju i mačevi s balčakom u obliku čaše. Toj kategoriji predmeta dobro su poznati mačevi iz Kastva i Grižana (kat. 172, 177-178, sl. 56). K. Vinski-Gasparini prilikom objave mača iz Kastva nije našla odgovarajuće analogije prema ukrasu balčaka, ali ga je zahvaljujući okovima povezala s balkanskim radionica-

a cylindrical socket, a stepped blade and a smooth interface between the blade and the shaft. It seems that the prolongation of the shaft in the form of a central rib is slightly flattened bringing it close to type L32, according to A. Bruno.<sup>433</sup> Such, generally large spear points, were mostly ritually and intentionally destroyed and deposited, which applies also to our example. Based on its characteristics, it could be linked to the spear points from the older part of the Urnfield culture, in particular of the HaA1 phase, which were used on a broad European territory, especially in the Carpathian basin and in the Alpine hinterlands.<sup>434</sup>

The spear point from Sv. Fuska, from the bay near the village of Pinezići on the western coast of Krk, is an old find known exclusively from a drawing published by C. Marchesetti (cat. 16, fig. 54),<sup>435</sup> and is thus harder to be defined typologically. Based on its basic form, that spear point could be associated with middle-sized spear points, with slightly flame-shaped points and a sharp transition between the blade and the elongated socket. The center of gravity is located towards the tip making it similar to the points of the large IIA group of the 3<sup>rd</sup> type, according to A. Bruno.<sup>436</sup>

The third spear point comes from Podbadanj near Crikvenica and was allegedly discovered in a hoard containing 13 spear points (cat. 119, fig. 54)<sup>437</sup> It is well preserved and could be included into the category of small laurel leaf-shaped points with a smooth interface between the leaf and the thick circular shaft, the center of gravity is markedly low, with two holes on the sides used for fixation. Generally, it could be included into the large IIB group of such spear points on the opposite territory of Italy.<sup>438</sup>

The spear point from Podbadanj as well as that of Sv. Fuska belong to very common finds on the territory of central Europe, which we know about from different contexts, from graves and hoards, ranging from the most ancient phases of the Urnfield culture up to the beginning of the Iron Age,<sup>439</sup> which is why they are chronologically less sensitive, in particular, if they have been discovered as isolated finds, as is the case on the Kvarner territory. Since such items were mainly not used for ritual purposes, they were defined as functional every-day items, primarily as points of throwing spears.

Also swords with a cup-like terminal part of the hilt, which are known from Kastav and Grižane (cat. 172, 177-178, fig. 56), are dated into the Late Bronze Age (or the beginning of the Early Iron Age). At the moment of the publication of the Kastav sword, K. Vinski-Gasparini had not found adequate comparisons with respect to the decoration of the cup-like terminal part, but she compared it to the workshops located on the Balkans due to the forms of metal plates for strengthening the scabbard.<sup>440</sup> Since it was discovered in a skeletal grave, she dated it into HaB1, linking the deceased to the local ethnicity separated from the populations of the Drava, Sava, Danube rivers and the northern part of the Bosnia river basins. She located the workshops of production of these swords on the territory to the south and east of the east Alpine region into which she included Istria and the coastal area of the Adriatic with its hinterlands.<sup>441</sup> Since the sword was broken and buried together with the deceased on the location of the lower town (Lokvina), we can assume it had a votive character. The same was assumed about the broken swords of Gattinara and Pergine (fig. 55: 2), dated into the Late Bronze Age HaB1 (PG3).<sup>442</sup> Very

<sup>432</sup> Nađen je prilikom istraživačke kampanje 1988. godine R. Starca. Usp. Starac 1994. Istraživanjima špilje zabilježeni su slojevi korištenja prostora i u vremenu kasnog brončanog doba usp. Malez 1974; Starac 1994; Komšo, Blečić 2007.

<sup>433</sup> Bruno 2012: 365, T. 13: 4.

<sup>434</sup> Hansen 1994: 66-67, Abb. 35; usp. Turk 1994: 106-107; Turk 1996: 111.

<sup>435</sup> Marchesetti 1903: T. XI: 18; Batović 1980: T. VI: 12.

<sup>436</sup> Bruno 2012: 354, T. 2: 3.

<sup>437</sup> Podatci dobiveni od vlasnika?! Vrh koplja nalazi se u privatnoj zbirici Drage Crnića (Starac 2004: 171).

<sup>438</sup> Različite varijante tipa 3, vjerojatno 3A (Bruno 2012: T. 22).

<sup>439</sup> Turk 1994: 111-114.

<sup>433</sup> Bruno 2012: 365, T. 13: 4.

<sup>434</sup> Hansen 1994: 66-67, Abb. 35; comp. Turk 1994: 106-107; Turk 1996: 111.

<sup>435</sup> Marchesetti 1903: T. XI: 18; Batović 1980: T. VI: 12.

<sup>436</sup> Bruno 2012: 354, T. 2: 3.

<sup>437</sup> Information from the owner?! The spear point is located in private collection of Drago Crnić (Starac 2004: 171).

<sup>438</sup> Different varieties of the type 3, most probably 3A (Bruno 2012: T. 22).

<sup>439</sup> Turk 1994: 111-114.

<sup>440</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 163-166; Glogović 1989: 13-14, T. 11: 1-2.


<sup>441</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 169.

<sup>442</sup> Comp. e.g. Blečić 2002: 99-100, 105, T. 1: 11; Bianco Peroni 1970: 105, cat. 283;

ma.<sup>440</sup> Budući da je bio nađen u skeletnom ukopu datirala ga je u vrijeme HaB1, povezujući ga uz domaći etnik, a ne uz nosioce KPŽ međuriječja Drave, Save i Dunava te sjeverne Bosne. Radionice takvih mačeva autorica je smjestila na područja južno i istočno od istočnoalpske regije u koja ulazi Istra i rubni jadranski pojas sa zaleđem.<sup>441</sup> S obzirom na to da je mač bio prelomljen i zajedno s pokojnikom pokopan na mjestu donjega grada (Lokvina), najvjerojatnije je bio votivnog karaktera. Votivnog karaktera su polomljeni mačevi iz Gattinare i Pergine (sl. 55: 2), datirani u razdoblje kasnog brončanog doba HaB1 (PG3) stupnja.<sup>442</sup> Maču iz Pergine približio se i mač iz Grižana, zbog ukrasa od tri rebra na balčaku, ali ga je zbog same forme K. Vinski-Gasparini bliže povezala uz mačeve iz Gornje Austrije, tj. s mačem iz Greina i poglavito s mačem iz St. Pantaleona u kome je vidjela i najsrodniji primjerak.<sup>443</sup>

Prema čaši balčaka mač iz Grižana najuže je srodan maču iz Moškanjca pogotovo zbog dekoracije njegove unutrašnje strane (sl. 55: 1).<sup>444</sup> Ricasso ukras na sječivu istaknutog središnjeg rebra pored oblika nasada na dnu balčaka, bili su dodatnim dokazima za užu povezanost mača iz Grižana s mačevima iz Pergine, St. Pantaleona i Moškanjca (sl. 55).<sup>445</sup> Na njemu je autorica vidjela utjecaje radioničkih krugova Karpatske kotline i istočnoalpskog područja, a datirala ga je s grupom mačeva tipa Königsdorf, baš kao i H. Müller-Karpe navedene analogije,<sup>446</sup> koji su se radili južno do granice njihova rasprostiranja. Samim time ukazala je na vrlo isprepletene odnose istočnoalpskog prostora i Tirola sa sjevernim Jadranom gdje su se, na svojevrsan način, odrazili opći modni trendovi vremena mlađe faze KPŽ.<sup>447</sup>

Kastavski mač, baš kao i njemu najbliži mač iz Grižana, predstavljaju najjužniji europski nalaz takvih tipova mačeva. Ali, kako su oni ipak tipološki teže određivi, a ukras odaje stilsku različitost uvjetovanu raznim utjecajima, ne predstavljaju oblik oružja koji bi bio tipičar kasnobrončanodobni za ovu ili širu regiju.<sup>448</sup> Temeljem istog, A. Harding oba primjerka razmatra u dvije različite varijante mačeva s balčakom oblika čaše, gdje ih je zabilježeno ukupno četiri, tj. pet (sl. 56).<sup>449</sup> Priznajući da nedostaju izravne ili egzaktne paralele, približava ih mačevima iz Rumunjske i to tako da mač iz Kastva uspoređuje uz mač tipa Marvila iz Stoboru<sup>450</sup> i Čalinești,<sup>451</sup> a mač iz Grižana uz tipove Stoboru mačeva npr. iz Dragu ili Stoboru.<sup>452</sup> Pri analiziranju mačeva punokovinskog rukohvata s rebrima na balčaku još se prije na mač iz Grižana osvrnuo i T. Bader kojega on i ubraja u tu veliku skupinu mačeva rasprostranjenu u Karpatskoj kotlini, zajedno s mačem iz Per-



**Slika 55.** Mačevi s balčakom u obliku čaše: 1-Moškanjci (prema Šinkovec 1995); 2-Pergine (prema Bianco Peroni 1970, Peroni 2004).

**Figure 55.** Swords with the cup like terminal part of the hilt: 1-Moškanjci (after Šinkovec 1995); 2-Pergine (after Bianco Peroni 1970, Peroni 2004).

close to the sword from Pergine in terms of form – due to three ribs on the terminal handle – is the sword from Grižane, which K. Vinski-Gasparini compared in form to the swords from Upper Austria. She compared it to the sword from Grein, and in particular, with the sword from St. Pantaleone which she considered to be the best analogy.<sup>443</sup>

With regard to the cup of the hilt, the closest analogy to the sword from Grižane comes from Moškanjci – mostly because of the decoration on the inner side of the cup (fig. 55: 1).<sup>444</sup> Ricasso decoration on the blade with an accentuated middle rib, along with the form of the hilt, was the main argument for establishing a closer connection between the sword from Grižane and the finds from Pergine, St. Pantaleon and Moškanjci (fig. 55).<sup>445</sup> The author recognized in it the influences of the workshops from the Carpathian basin and the eastern Alpine area and dated it, in line with H. Müller-Karpe's suggestion, within the group of swords of

<sup>440</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 163-166; Glogović 1989: 13-14, T. 11: 1-2.

<sup>441</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 169.

<sup>442</sup> Usp. npr. Blečić 2002: 99-100, 105, T. 1: 11; Bianco Peroni 1970: 105, kat. 283; Negroni Catacchio et al. 1979: 81, kat. 74; Peroni 2004: 166-168, Fig. 7.

<sup>443</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 164-165; usp. Müller-Karpe 1961: 38, 40, T. 48: 5, 7.

<sup>444</sup> Šinkovec 1995: 110, T. 32: 218.

<sup>445</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 164. Mač iz Ormoža isključen je iz analize jer je potvrđeno kako se radi o kopiji (Urankar 2003).

<sup>446</sup> Müller-Karpe 1961: 36-37, T. 37-40.

<sup>447</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 165.

<sup>448</sup> Batović 1980: 37, T. 8: 1; Glogović 1989: 13-14, 40-41, T. 11: 1-2. U starijim su se raspravama mačevi kronološki pripisivali kraju brončanog i početku željeznog doba na tim prostorima, odnosno prijelaznoj fazi u 10./9. stoljeće (Batović 1965: 58-60). Tako su zapravo kastavski i grižanski mač sinkronizirani s kasnom fazom brončanog doba Italije (Batović 1973: 56-57; Batović 1980: 41-48; Batović 1983: 303-304; Batović 1987a: 346-351; Čović 1986: 67-69; Glogović 1989: 41).

<sup>449</sup> Harding 1995: 78-79, T. 31: 244, 32: 249.

<sup>450</sup> Bader 1991: T. 44: 351.

<sup>451</sup> Bader 1991: T. 46: 352.

<sup>452</sup> Bader 1991: T. 40: 342; 42: 344.

Negroni Catacchio et al. 1979: 81, kat. 74; Peroni 2004: 166-168, Fig. 7.


<sup>443</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 164-165; comp. Müller-Karpe 1961: 38, 40, T. 48: 5, 7.

<sup>444</sup> Šinkovec 1995: 110, T. 32: 218.

<sup>445</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 164. The sword from Ormož was eliminated from the analysis since it was confirmed that it was a copy (Urankar 2003).







**Slika 56.** Karta rasprostranjenosti mačeva s balčakom u obliku čaše (nadopunjeno prema Harding 1995) (Lista 12).

**Figure 56.** Distribution map of swords with a cup like terminal part of the hilt (supplemented after Harding 1995) (List 12).

gine (sl. 57).<sup>453</sup> Upravo mnoštvo morfološki sličnih mačeva grižansko-me potječe iz zapadne Trandanubije, posebno iz Hajdúböszörménya, zastupljenih u više varijanti. Kastavskom se pak maču, kojeg krasí ukras tzv. stilizirane "ptičje lađe" na ploči rukohvata, paralele mogu pronaći kod istočnih primjeraka; iz Szikszóa, odnosno kod mačeva iz Tiszakaráda i Tiszalóka, srodnog ili istog linearno urezanog ukrasa balčaka i čaše.<sup>454</sup> Navedeno je A. Hardingu ipak poslužilo kao uzor ili inspiracija za tipološko usklađivanje i interpretiranje naših mačeva, pa ih i vremenski datira po rumunjskim nalazima, odnosno u njihove kronološke stupnjeve Turia-Jupalnic i Moigrad-Tăuteu,<sup>455</sup> što je pri atribuiranju kronološkog ekvivalenta mađarskih nalaza određeno horizontom Hajdúböszörmény i sinkronizirano u HaB1 stupanj.<sup>456</sup> Međutim, isto je za nalaze iz Kvarnera ostalo prilično neodređenim. Naime, u posljednjem osvrtu na isti tip mačeva, Ch. Pare smatra, budući da oni na prostoru Karpatske kotline obilježavaju zadnju razvojnu fazu istoimenih mačeva, da se mač iz Kastva, kao i srodni iz Celldömölk-Sághegy ostave, moraju smjestiti u stupanj HaB2, tj. na sam prijelaz BF3b/PF1a, odnosno u drugu polovinu 10. stoljeća, ostvarujući time njihovu sinkronizaciju rasprostranjenosti na širem prostoru Europe.<sup>457</sup> Mač iz Celldömölk-Sághegy ipak neće obilježavati bližu paralelu maču iz Kastva, nego upravo maču iz Grižane, jer oba karakterizira ukras od tri rebra na balčaku (sl. 57). Imaju li stoga mačevi glatkog balčaka, poput kastavskog, možda određenu višu kronološku poziciju u odnosu na one mlađe s rebrima, teško je sa sigurnošću potvrditi. Sigurno je ipak sljedeće: kvarnerski mačevi predstavljaju iznimne nalaze s obzirom na kontekst njihova nalaženja,<sup>458</sup> u odnos na koncentraciju na području "vrha" Kvar-

the Königsdorf type.<sup>446</sup> She demonstrated the intertwined relations of the eastern Alpine area and Tirol with the northern Adriatic, where the general fashionable trends of the younger phase of Urnfield culture were reflected in a specific local way.<sup>447</sup>

The sword from Kastav, as well as the example from Grižane, represents the most southern find of this type of swords. However, since they are typologically harder to determine and their decoration reflects a stylistic variability formed by different influences, they do not represent, neither regionally nor on a wider area, a typical weapon of the Late Bronze Age.<sup>448</sup> On the contrary, A. Harding considered the swords from Kastav and Grižane as two different variants of swords with a cup like terminal part of the hilt from the territory of the former Yugoslavia where four, or better five examples were known (fig. 56).<sup>449</sup> He also admitted the lack of direct or exact parallels, but considered them being close to swords from Romania. In his opinion, the sword from Kastav could be compared to the examples of the Marvila type from Stoboru<sup>450</sup> and Călinești,<sup>451</sup> and the sword from Grižane to the examples of the type Stoboru from Dragu or Stoboru.<sup>452</sup> Even before analyzing the swords with a cast handle with ribs on the hilt, Tiberius Bader included the example from Grižane together with the find from Pergine into this large group spread across the Carpathian basin (fig. 57).<sup>453</sup> Actually, a large number of morphologically similar swords to the find from Grižane come from western Transdanubia, especially from Hajdúböszörmény, where several

<sup>453</sup> Bader 1991: T. 69B.

<sup>454</sup> Mozsolics 2000: T. 24: 2; T. 31: 2; T. 35: 1-2; T. 99: 9; T. 107: 3a; T. 110: 3; usp. Stockhammer 2004: 118-126, Abb. 36. Stilizirani urezani motiv "ptičje lađe" na ploči rukohvata tipični je model obrtničkih praksi tzv. istočnog, mađarsko-rumunjskog kulturnog kruga. Ipak, isti ih autor tipološki ne opredjeljuje.

<sup>455</sup> Harding 1995: 78-79.

<sup>456</sup> Mozsolics 2000: 43-46, 80-84-86.

<sup>457</sup> Pare 2008: 87, Fig. 5.9 B5.

<sup>458</sup> Oba su mača bila ritualizirana; kastavski polomljen na tri dijela, a grižanski pribijen u pukotinu matične stijene na prostoru kamenoloma, usp. Starac 2004: 170; vidi katalog *Grižane*.

<sup>446</sup> Müller-Karpe 1961: 36-37, T. 37-40.

<sup>447</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 165.

<sup>448</sup> Batović 1980: 37, T. 8: 1; Glogović 1989: 13-14, 40-41, T. 11: 1-2. In the older discussions these swords were chronologically attributed to the end of Bronze and the beginning of Iron Age on these territories – they were placed in to the transition phase of the 10<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> century (Batović 1965: 58-60). Consequently the swords from Kastav and Grižane were synchronized with the late phase of the Bronze Age of BF2 of Italy (Batović 1973: 56-57; Batović 1980: 41-48; Batović 1983: 303-304; Batović 1987a: 346-351; Čović 1986: 67-69; Glogović 1989: 41).


<sup>449</sup> Harding 1995: 78-79, T. 31: 244, 32: 249.

<sup>450</sup> Bader 1991: T. 44: 351.

<sup>451</sup> Bader 1991: T. 46: 352.

<sup>452</sup> Bader 1991: T. 40: 342; 42: 344.

<sup>453</sup> Bader 1991: T. 69B.



**Slika 57.** Pregledna karta rasprostranjenosti mačeva s balčakom u obliku čaše i sa tri ukrasna horizontalna rebra (prema Bader 1991; Mozsolics 2000).  
**Figure 57.** Distribution map of the swords with a cup like terminal part of the hilt and the swords with a cast handle with ribs on the hilt (after Bader 1991; Mozsolics 2000).

nera, te posebno uslijed činjenice malobrojnosti nalaza vojničke opreme čitavog sjevernojadranskog područja. Time se dobro uklapaju u okolnosti poznate u Italiji, odnosno u široj regiji, gdje su mačevi s balčakom u obliku čaše HaB1/B2 stupnja izrazito rijetki, i time, naravno, stoje u suprotnosti s nalazima na prostoru čitave Karpatske kotline.<sup>459</sup> Ne čini se stoga pogrešnim razumijevati predmetne mačeve kao prestižna dobra u međudodnosu s panonsko-karpatskim utjecajima i transferima u tada već neprikosnovenoj uhodanoj tradiciji, ne tražeći pritom u njima izričitost etničkih nosioca ili eventualnog bližeg obrtničkog središta kako je to davnih dana predlagala K. Vinski-Gasparini.<sup>460</sup>

Među oružjem treba spomenuti i bojni krivi nož punog lijevanog rukohvata iz Svetog Jurja (kat. 230). Otkada je objavljen<sup>461</sup> također je više puta obrađivan u literaturi, s mnoštvom različitih pokušaja njegova kulturološkog i kronološkog interpretiranja. Najdetaljnije se tom "izazovu" posvetila D. Glogović koja je i izdvojila cijelu grupu srodnih noževa i imenovala ih upravo po tom najbolje očuvanom nalazu – noževi tipa Jurjevo (sl. 58).<sup>462</sup> U tip je pribrojila noževe iz Liburnije; Đeverske i dva iz nepoznatog nalazišta te nož iz Metka u Lici. Već prije se njima pozabavio Š. Batović određujući ih kao tipične oblike liburnske skupine,<sup>463</sup> datirane, neodlučno, u kasnobrončano doba Liburnije?! D. Glogović im nalazi brojne srodnosti u širem prostoru pr. kod noževa tipa Velem St. Vid ili Bismantova tipa A protovillanovske kulture te ih također široko datira u kasnobrončano doba,<sup>464</sup> odnosno

variants are found. Similarities to the sword from Kastav, decorated with the so called stylized "bird-boat" on the hilt, can be observed in eastern examples – from Szikszó, and swords from Tiszakarád and Tiszalök, which have a similar decoration of linear incisions on the terminal.<sup>454</sup> It is obvious that this opinion served as a model or inspiration to A. Harding for his typological adjustment and interpretation of swords – consequently he dated them according to the finds from Romania into their chronological phases *Turia-Jupalnic* and *Moigrad-Tăuteu*<sup>455</sup> which is equated in Hungary with the horizon of Hajdúböszörmény and synchronized with the phase HaB1.<sup>456</sup> However, the chronology of swords from Kvarner remained undetermined since in his last reflection of these types of swords, Ch. Pare thinks that they designate the last phase of development of these swords in the Carpathian basin. Consequently the sword from Kastav as well as the similar sword from the hoard from Celldömölk-Sághegy should be dated to HaB2, which is the transition between BF3b and PF1a in Italy, and could be dated to the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century creating with this a synchronization of their distribution on the broader territory of Europe.<sup>457</sup> The sword from Celldömölk-Sághegy is not a relevant comparison to the sword from Kastav, but a better one than to the sword from Grižane, since both of them are characterized by the decoration of three ribs on the hilt (fig. 57). The question remains whether the swords with a smooth hilt, as the example from Kastav, might represent a younger type than those with three ribs? Nevertheless, we can be pretty sure that the swords from the Kvarner area represent exceptional discoveries, and this due to the context of their discovery,<sup>458</sup> the concentration of such finds on the "tip" of the bay, and the overall scarcity of military equipment finds in the whole region of the northern Adriatic. Thanks to such characteristics they fit well into the circumstances known in Italy and the broader region, where swords with cup-shaped terminal dated to the HaB1/B2 are extremely rarely found, as opposed to the multitude of such

<sup>459</sup> Stockhammer 2004: 87-91, fn. 287, K. 31; 32; 33; usp. Pare 1998: 354-356, 366-368, Abb. 33: 4.

<sup>460</sup> U suprotnosti sa svime navedenim stoji pak relativno noviji osvrt na mač iz Kastva, onaj V. Barbarića, kojime osvježava memoriju na promišljanja Š. Batovića iz 80-ih godina prošlog stoljeća. Naime, autor predmetni mač definira u kategoriji kratkih mačeva punokovinskog rukohvata iz prostora sjeverne Dalmacije (?), iako Kastav ni teritorijalno ni kulturno ne pripada tom miljeu. Smatra da je navodna proizvodnja za takav tip mača dokumentirana kalupima u Varvari, što se može relativizirati eventualno za ulomak okova korica mača (usp. Ludajić 2005), uvrštavajući ga u oblike značajne za kasno brončano doba rasprostranjene na prostoru Dalmacije, Istre i središnje Bosne (Barbarić 2009: 316, Fig. 6: 3)!?

<sup>461</sup> Ljubić 1889: T. X: 37.

<sup>462</sup> Glogović 1989: 16, T. 12: 1; Glogović 1993: 239-243, Fig. 1: 1.

<sup>463</sup> Batović 1980: 36, T. VIII: 4, T. IX: 1-2; Batović 1983: 313-314, Fig. 20: 5, T. XLVI: 8.

<sup>464</sup> Glogović 1989: 16.


<sup>454</sup> Mozsolics 2000: T. 24: 2; T. 31: 2; T. 35: 1-2; T. 99: 9; T. 107: 3a; T. 110: 3; comp. Stockhammer 2004: 118-126, Abb. 36. Stylized incised motive of the "bird-boat" on the hilt is a typical model of manufacture practices of the so called eastern, Hungarian and Romanian cultural circle. However, the same author does not determine them typologically.

<sup>455</sup> Harding 1995: 78-79.

<sup>456</sup> Mozsolics 2000: 43-46, 80-84-86.

<sup>457</sup> Pare 2008: 87, Fig. 5.9 B5.

<sup>458</sup> Both swords were ritually manipulated – the example from Kastav was broken in three pieces and the example from Grižane driven in to a crack of the bedrock on the territory of the quarry. Comp. Starac 2004: 170; see catalogue *Grižane*.



**Slika 58.** Karta rasprostranjenosti bojnih noževa tipa Jurjevo (prema Glogović 1993) (Lista 13).

**Figure 58.** Distribution map of curved battle knife with a cast handle of Jurjevo type (after Glogović 1993) (List 13).

u vrijeme "ne starije od HaB2 stupnja".<sup>465</sup> Međutim, drugi autori nož iz Jurjeva vremenski znatno više datiraju i analoški povezuju uz nož iz Metka (koji isto tako nema poznate nalazišne podatke), kulturološki pripisuju u japodsku skupinu,<sup>466</sup> a kronološki smještaju na prijelaz HaA2/B1.<sup>467</sup>

U interpretaciji njegovih stilskih obilježja doprinos su pružili B. Čović i R. Drechsler-Bižić koji, sukladno, u motivu urezanih i šrafiranih trokuta prepoznaju povorke ratnika s kacigama na glavi, ne samo dekorativnog već i simboličkog, ritualnog značenja. Element dvostrukih kosih linija na glavama povorke ratnika na nožu iz Jurjeva izostaje, ali je poznat na nožu iz Metka i tumačen je kao polumjesečasti oblik izravno asociran s kapom ili kacigom koja je u japodskoj nošnji zauzimala posebnu ulogu.<sup>468</sup> Time bi noževi tipa Jurjevo bili uklopljeni u širenje tzv. zapadnobalkanskog geometrijskog stila, kojemu se podrijetlo tražilo u uzorcima kasnog brončanog doba sjeverne Hrvatske pa su shodno tomu i nešto više vremenski objašnjeni.<sup>469</sup>

finds in the Carpathian basin.<sup>459</sup> It does not seem wrong to perceive such swords as prestigious goods within the relations with the Pannonian and Carpathian influences and transfers, but without searching in them the expressiveness of ethnic holders or of a possible closer creative center, as long ago suggested by K. Vinski-Gasparini.<sup>460</sup>

Among weapons, also the curved battle knife with a cast handle from Sveti Juraj (or Jurjevo) (cat. 230) should be mentioned. After the initial publication<sup>461</sup> it was analyzed and interpreted several times in different cultural and chronological contexts. The most "accurate" analysis was conducted by D. Glogović who singled out a whole group of similar knives and denominated them after the best preserved example – as Jurjevo type knives<sup>462</sup> (fig. 58). She added into this group the knives from Liburnia, an example from Đeverske, two examples without any information about their origins and the knife from Medak in Lika. Before they were analyzed by Š. Batović, who considered them being a typical form of the Liburnian group<sup>463</sup> and dated them without any precision into the Late Bronze Age of Liburnia?! D. Glogović listed several similarities in the broader region – for example in the group of knives of the Velem St. Vid or the Bismantova type A of the Protovillanova culture and dated them into the Late Bronze Age<sup>464</sup> in a period "not older than the HaB2 phase".<sup>465</sup> Meanwhile other authors consider the knife from Jurjevo older and connect it with the knife from Medak (which unfortunately also has no exact context), culturally attributed them both to the Japodian culture group<sup>466</sup> and dated them into the transition from HaA2 to HaB1.<sup>467</sup>

In interpreting their stylistic characteristics, the contribution of Borivoj Čović and Ruža Drechsler-Bižić cannot be ignored, who were able to identify in the motive of hatched triangles the decoration of processions of warriors with helmets on their heads - a decoration with a decorative, but also a symbolic and a ritual meaning. The element of double oblique lines on the heads of the procession of warriors on the knife from Jurjevo is missing, but it is present on the knife from Medak. There it was interpreted as a crescent moon directly associated with a hat or a helmet which played a special role in the Japodian costume.<sup>468</sup> Interpreted in this way the knives of the Jurjevo type would be connected with the spread of the so called west Balkan geometric style, whose origins were sought in the role models of the Urnfield culture of northern Croatia and consequently interpreted as being slightly older.<sup>469</sup>

<sup>465</sup> Glogović 1993: 242.

<sup>466</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1983: 383-384; Bakarić 1993: 100, kat. 49; Bakarić 2004a: 92, Sl. 123; Bakarić 2008: 194, kat. 139.

<sup>467</sup> Balen-Letunić 2008: 22.

<sup>468</sup> Kukoč 1995: 62, Sl. 5: 4.

<sup>469</sup> Čović 1980: 20, T. III: 9; Drechsler-Bižić 1983: 384; Glogović 1993: 239-240.

<sup>459</sup> Stockhammer 2004: 87-91, f.n. 287, K. 31; 32; 33; comp. Pare 1998: 354-356, 366-368, Abb. 33: 4.

<sup>460</sup> Contrary to everything written, stands the relatively recent mentioning of the sword from Kastav written by V. Barbarić who reaches back to the consideration of Š. Batović from the 80s of the last century. He defines the sword in the category of short swords with a solid hilt from the territory of northern Dalmatia (?) although Kastav does not territorially nor culturally belong in to this environment. He considers that the production of these types of swords is documented in the molds from Varvara, which might be possible for a fragment of the sword sheet (comp. Ludajić 2005), placing it among the forms characteristic for the Late Bronze Age distributed on the territory of Dalmatia, Istria and central Bosnia (Barbarić 2009: 316, Fig. 6: 3)?

<sup>461</sup> Ljubić 1889: T. X: 37.

<sup>462</sup> Glogović 1989: 16, T. 12: 1; Glogović 1993: 239-243, Fig. 1: 1.

<sup>463</sup> Batović 1980: 36, T. VIII: 4, T. IX: 1-2; Batović 1983: 313-314, Fig. 20: 5, T. XLVI: 8. Glogović 1989: 16.


<sup>464</sup> Glogović 1993: 242.

<sup>466</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1983: 383-384; Bakarić 1993: 100, kat. 49; Bakarić 2004a: 92, Sl. 123; Bakarić 2008a: 194, kat. 139.

<sup>467</sup> Balen-Letunić 2008: 22.

<sup>468</sup> Kukoč 1995: 62, Sl. 5: 4.

<sup>469</sup> Čović 1980: 20, T. III: 9; Drechsler-Bižić 1983: 384; Glogović 1993: 239-240.



**Slika 59.** Pojedinačni nalazi iz Rijeke ili bliže okolice.  
**Figure 59.** Individual finds from Rijeka or the surrounding area.





## Regionalne koiné kraja kasnog brončanog i prijelaza na željezno doba

Karakteristična pojava mlađe faze kasnog brončanog doba na prostranom europskom kontinentu, od Baltičkog do Egejskog mora, naočalasta je fibula. Ta fibula ulazi u modu u vrijeme HaB1, ako ne i ranije, ali će se u svojim brojnim razvojnim tipovima i različitim varijantama zadržati u uporabi ženske mode sve do HaC, pa čak i HaD1 razdoblja.<sup>470</sup> Njezino ishodište u ideji i osnovnom oblikovanju smatra se područje Karpatske kotline, iako se ona najduže, i s najviše varijanti, zadržava na njezinim rubnim dijelovima, osobito na području Balkana i jugoistočnog alpskog prostora (sl. 60). Među najstarije tipove spada jednodijelna naočalasta fibula sa središnjom malom osmicom, koje je P. Betzler definirao kao nadregionalni tip Haslau-Regelsbrunn.<sup>471</sup> Toj grupi fibula pribrajaju se i četiri spiralna diska, od četiri različite fibule, koje potječu iz Rijeke ili njezine najbliže okolice (kat. 124-127, sl. 56), te vjerojatno izgubljena fibula iz Kastva.<sup>472</sup> O tim je fibulama već opširno raspravljala D. Glogović,<sup>473</sup> referirajući se i na prethodno objavljene rezultate F. Lo Schiavo, koja je strukturirala tipološki i kronološki, a možda i razvojno, naočalaste fibule na zemljopisnom prostoru Japoda i Liburna. Prema njezinoj podjeli riječki bi primjerci pripadali tipu A naočalastih fibula kojima brojne paralele postoje u nekropolama Kompolja, Prozora itd.<sup>474</sup> Zbog toga bi upravo ulomak fibule iz Rijeke (kat. 126) mogli nešto bliže usporediti s varijantom iz te velike klase fibula, s tipom Kompolja, s nešto izduženijom ili središnjom osmicom koja se počinje koristiti od vremena 1. faze japodske grupe, tj. od 11. i 10. stoljeća, s izrazito dugim trajanjem, čak sve do 8. stoljeća.<sup>475</sup>

Zanimljivo je da u dosadašnjim istraživanjima takav tip fibula nije zabilježen niti na kvarnerskom otočnom niti na sjevernodalma-

## The regional koiné from the end of the Late Bronze Age and the transition to the Iron Age

A characteristic element of the Late Bronze Age on the European continent, stretching from the Baltic to the Aegean Sea, is the spectacle fibula. It makes its appearance in HaB1 and it will remain in use, in its numerous developmental types and forms, all the way to HaC and even HaD1 period.<sup>470</sup> The area of the Carpathian plain is considered to be its ideological and formal place of origin, although it remained for the longest period in use on the marginal area of its distribution where it developed several new forms and variants – in particular on the territory of the Balkans and the south-eastern Alpine area (fig. 60). Among the oldest types we should list the simple form a single piece of wire manufactured, spectacle fibula with a little loop in the form of the number eight in the middle, which were determined by Betzler as the type Haslau-Regelsbrunn.<sup>471</sup>

Four spiral discs deriving from four different fibulae from Rijeka and its closest vicinity (cat. 124-127, fig. 56) and most probably the lost fibulae from Jurjevo and Kastav may be attributed to this group.<sup>472</sup> D. Glogović discussed these fibulae in detail,<sup>473</sup> referring to previously published results by F. Lo Schiavo, who put in order the spectacle fibulae on the geographic territory of Japodi and Liburn, typologically, chronologically and most probably also evolutionary. According to her division, the examples from Rijeka should be included into type A, which was numerous present in the necropoles in Kompolja, Prozor etc.<sup>474</sup>

Thus, a closer comparison of the example from Rijeka (cat. 126) could be made with the variant denominated as the Kompolja type, which have an elongated and larger central loop in the form of the number eight. Their use started from the period of the 1st phase of the Japodian culture in the 11th and 10th century and lasted all the way to the 8th century.<sup>475</sup>

<sup>470</sup> Teržan 2000: 37-40, Abb. 84; Teržan 2002: 90; Vasić 1999: 37-40, T. 14: 190-194, T. 15, T. 16, T. 17: 225-227. Usp. Pabst 2000; Pabst 2012.

<sup>471</sup> Betzler 1974: 91, T. 82.

<sup>472</sup> Glogović 2003: T. 13: 129-132, 134; Blečić 2002: 86, 105, kat. 1.1.

<sup>473</sup> Glogović 1989: 22-23; Glogović 2003: 24-25.

<sup>474</sup> Lo Schiavo, 1970: 442-443, T. XIII: 17; XIV: 3, 30: 1-2; Raunig 1982: T. 1: 2; Drechsler-Bižić 1987: 385. Karta rasprostiranja predmetnog tipa fibula nadopunjena je s nalazima iz nalazišta: Picugi, Kaštelir kod Nove Vasi u Istri, Kastav i Rijeka, i Löfkend u Albaniji (Papadopoulos et al. 2007: 119, Fig. 10).

<sup>475</sup> Pabst 2012: 59-63, Abb. 3,5.

<sup>470</sup> Teržan 2000: 37-40, Abb. 84; Teržan 2002: 90; Vasić 1999: 37-40, T. 14: 190-194, T. 15, T. 16, T. 17: 225-227. Comp. Pabst 2000; Pabst 2012.


<sup>471</sup> Betzler 1974: 91, T. 82.

<sup>472</sup> Glogović 2003: T. 13: 129-132, 134; Blečić 2002: 86, 105, kat. 1.1.

<sup>473</sup> Glogović 1989: 22-23; Glogović 2003: 24-25.

<sup>474</sup> Lo Schiavo, 1970: 442-443, T. XIII: 17; XIV: 3, 30: 1-2; Raunig 1982: T. 1: 2; Drechsler-Bižić 1987: 385. The map of distribution of these fibulae should be supplemented with finds from sites of: Picugi, Kaštelir near Nova Vas in Istria, Kastav and Rijeka and Löfkend in Albania (Papadopoulos et al. 2007: 119, Fig. 10).

<sup>475</sup> Pabst 2012: 59-63, Abb. 3,5.



**Slika 60.** Rasprostranjenost fibula tipa Haslau-Regelsbrunn, južno od dunavskog koljena (nadopunjeno prema Vasić 1999, Teržan 2000).

**Figure 60.** Distribution map of spectacle fibula of the Haslau-Regelsbrunn type; south of the Danube knee (supplemented after Vasić 1999; Teržan 2000).

tinskom prostoru. Poznat je samo u sjevernim dijelovima Istre<sup>476</sup> i Kvarnera (sl. 60), koji su bili integralnim dijelom kulturološkog prožimanja s kontinentalnim kompleksom KPŽ, posebno već istaknute dobovske skupine, gdje su te fibule bile jedan od vodećih oblika zastupljene nošnje na nekropoli Dobove,<sup>477</sup> i može se reći, Velike Gorice.<sup>478</sup>

Predodžbu dinamike te kulturne *koiné* već u novom kulturnom procesu pospješuje još jedan predmet neupitne ženske atribucije, vrlo često asociran upravo s naočalastim fibulama različitih varijanti. To su brončane ukrašene falere s trnom kakve potječu

Interestingly, this fibulae type has been recorded neither on the Kvarner islands, nor in the northern Dalmatian area. It was present only in the northern parts of Istria<sup>476</sup> and Kvarner (fig. 60) that were in direct contact with the continental complex of the Urnified culture, in particular the already mentioned Dobova group, where such fibulae were among the major elements of the attire on the necropolis of Dobova<sup>477</sup> and also of Velika Gorica.<sup>478</sup>

A conception of the dynamics of this cultural *koiné* in a new cultural process was fostered by another artifact of unquestionable female

<sup>476</sup> Po jedan primjerak potječe iz Picugi (Glogović 2003: 23, T. 13: 127) i iz Kaštelira kod Nove vasi (Sakara Sučević 2004: kat. 40). Tim fibulama treba dodati i malu lučnu fibulu sa zadebljanim i izdignutim lukom iz Picugi (Glogović 2003: T. 13: 118), pa će zajedno predstavljati najstarije pojave fibula u Istri. Tako ostaje nejasnim zbog čega D. Glogović navodi kako su najstarije fibule u Istri lučne fibule s listastim lukom (Glogović 2003: 2).


<sup>477</sup> Starè 1975: T. 1: 4; T. 18: 108: 3; T. 35: 250: 1...

<sup>478</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: T. 120: 11-12; T. 104: 4, 9-11.

<sup>476</sup> Individual examples come from Picugi (Glogović 2003: 23, T. 13: 127) and Kaštelir near Nova vas (Sakara Sučević 2004: cat. 40). One should add to them also a small bowed fibula with a thickened and elevated bow from Picugi (Glogović 2003: T. 13: 118) consequently marking together the oldest appearance of fibulae in Istria. Still it remains unclear why D. Glogović states that the oldest fibulae in Istria are the bowed fibulae with a leaf-shaped bow (Glogović 2003: 2).


<sup>477</sup> Starè 1975: T. 1: 4; T. 18: 108: 3; T. 35: 250: 1...

<sup>478</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: T. 120: 11-12; T. 104: 4, 9-11.



Slika 61. Izbor iz inventara groba 155 nekropole Brežec kod Škocjana (prema Vitri 1977).

Figure 61. Selection of finds from grave 155 in Brežec, Škocjan (after Vitri 1977).



**Slika 62.** Ukrašene brončane falere s trnom tipa I ili *Caput Adriae*: 1-3. Škocjan, 4. Ljubljana, 5. Biljani Donji, 6. Rifnik, 7. Mokronog, 8. Osor (prema Blečić Kavur 2012c).

**Figure 62.** Decorative bronze phalera with a thorn of type I or *Caput Adriae* type: 1-3. Škocjan, 4. Ljubljana, 5. Biljani Donji, 6. Rifnik, 7. Mokronog, 8. Osor (after Blečić Kavur 2012c).

iz Osora (kat. 96-97), od kojih je veći primjerak ukrašen urezanim koncentričnim kružnicama u središnjem dijelu, te rombično urezanim ukrasom konkavnih stranica uokolo središnjeg zašiljenog trna (kat. 96). Dva snopa od četiri usporedno urezane linije dijele prostor površine u dva dijela. U središnjoj traci, a uz snopove kružnica, urezan je i ornament niza girlandi. S obzirom na oblik i izveden ukras osorska je falera pribrojena tipu I ili tipu *Caput Adriae*,<sup>479</sup> kojeg obilježavaju falere kalotastog oblika s manjim zašiljenim trnom s vanjske strane i trokutasto zašiljenom ušicom s unutarnje strane, odnosno geometrijski izveden urezani ukras s vanjske strane (sl. 62). To označava najveći broj falera iz područja *Caput Adriae* (sl. 63), čime ih prostorno i omeđuje, ponajprije iz Škocjana gdje su zabilježena najvjerojatnije četiri primjerka, u nekropoli Brežec, grobovi 112, 156?<sup>480</sup> (sl. 62: 1-2) i u ostavi Mušja jama<sup>481</sup> (sl. 62: 3). Pribrojen im je i primjerak iz Ljubljane SAZU, grob 36<sup>482</sup> (sl. 62: 4). S obzirom na osnovni model i pojednostavljen repertoar ukrasa raspoređeni su u varijantu Ia, dok raskošniju varijantu, ili tip Ib, obilježavaju falere iz Rifnika, grob 1903/49,<sup>483</sup> zatim manji, ali prepoznatljiv ulomak iste iz uništene nekropole Ostrožnik kod Mokronoga,<sup>484</sup> te opisani ulomak falere iz Osora (sl. 62: 6-8), predstavljajući ujedno najraskošniji primjerak s obzirom na izvedbu čak dva reda tekućih girlandi.

Izuzetno tipa *Caput Adriae*, razlikuju se još picenski (tip II), dinarski (tip III) i tip Vergina (tip IV), čija nam koncentracija na određenom

attribution often associated exactly with spectacle fibulae of different types. These were bronze phalerae with a thorn, like the one coming from Osor (cat. 96-97), which were mostly decorated with incised concentric circles in the central part and a rhomboidally incised decoration with concave sides around the central pointed thorn (cat. 96). Two sheaves made from four parallel incised lines divide the space into two parts. In the central band, beside the sheaves of the circles, also an ornament of continuous garlands is incised. Due to its form and decoration, the phalera from Osor was attributed to type I or the *Caput Adriae* type.<sup>479</sup> These are phalerae of calotte shape with a smaller thorn on the outer and a triangularly shaped loop on the inner side, and a geometric decoration on the outer surface (fig. 62). These formal characteristics are typical in most phalerae from the territory of *Caput Adriae* and its hinterlands (fig. 63). Four of them were discovered in Škocjan in the necropolis of Brežec in graves 112 and 156(?)<sup>480</sup> (fig. 62: 1-2) and in the hoard of Mušja jama<sup>481</sup> (fig. 62: 3), whereas also another example from Ljubljana SAZU grave 36 could be added here<sup>482</sup> (fig. 62: 4). Due to their basic form and simplified decoration, they were included into variant Ia, whereas the luxurious variant Ib is marked by the phalera from Rifnik, grave 1903/49,<sup>483</sup> a small but recognizable fragment from the necropolis of Ostrožnik near Mokronog<sup>484</sup> and the described fragment from Osor (fig. 62: 6-8) which represents the most luxurious exemplar decorated with even two lines of continuous garlands.

<sup>479</sup> Blečić Kavur 2012c: 43-45, Sl. 2; Sl. 5.

<sup>480</sup> Vitri 1977: 91-92, Sl. 15: 41, T. IX: T. 112. 1; T. XVI: T. 156. 2.

<sup>481</sup> Batović 1980: T. II: 10; Gabrovec 1983: 85, Sl. 9: 12.

<sup>482</sup> Starè 1954: 49-50, T. XXXII: 2; T. LXXX: 11.

<sup>483</sup> Teržan 1990a: 69, 99, f.n. 221, Sl. 22: 3.

<sup>484</sup> Gabrovec 1965: T. 4: 8.

<sup>479</sup> Blečić Kavur 2012c: 43-45, Sl. 2; Sl. 5.


<sup>480</sup> Vitri 1977: 91-92, Sl. 15: 41, T. IX: T. 112. 1; T. XVI: T. 156. 2.

<sup>481</sup> Batović 1980: T. II: 10; Gabrovec 1983: 85, Sl. 9: 12.

<sup>482</sup> Starè 1954: 49-50, T. XXXII: 2; T. LXXX: 11.

<sup>483</sup> Teržan 1990a: 69, 99, f.n. 221, Sl. 22: 3.

<sup>484</sup> Gabrovec 1965: T. 4: 8.



**Slika 63.** Karta prostorne raširenosti ukrašenih falera s trnom: tip I (*Caput Adriae* ●), tip II (Picenski ■), tip III (Dinarski ▲), tip IV (Vergina ◆) (prema Blečić Kavur 2012c) (Lista 14).

**Figure 63.** Distribution map of decorated phalerae with a thorn: type I (*Caput Adriae* ●), type II (Picenum ■), type III (Dinaric ▲), type IV (Vergina ◆) (after Blečić Kavur 2012c) (List 14).

prostoru ukazuje, unatoč srodnostima, individualiziranje esteti- cizma, tj. mjesne specifičnosti izradbe, načine nošenja i svakako deponiranja tih predmeta, kao izdvojene grupe nakita koja je bila ideološki i semantički prisutna u nošnji širokog kulturnog prostora (sl. 63). Falere s područja *Caput Adriae* i zaleđa, svjedoče kako one nisu morale biti isključivo u materijalno ispostavljenim ansamblima nošnje pokojnica. Riječ je ponajprije o istaknutim osobnostima čiji je status morao biti znatno iznad prosječnog, pa i od samog vrha aristokracije zajednice kojemu je pripadala. Zato se iznimna vrijednost pripisuje upravo šifriranim znakovima u ornamentu svih izdvojenih tipova falera, kao predmetima malih dimenzija ali velikog narativnog sadržaja.<sup>485</sup> Njima se, kao nosite- ljima određenih simboličkih informacija, tj. kao komunikacijskom sredstvu, uglavnom pridavao astralni, solarni i kozmološki apo- strof, zbog čega su mogle imati, u smislu višeznačnosti njihove metafore, i ulogu amuleta zaštitnika, apotropejskog i profilaktič- kog, magičnog i metafizičkog.<sup>486</sup> U svakom pogledu, sustavnom je analizom ustanovljeno kako se takvi predmeti ženskog atributa pojavljuju kao medij sa svrhom amblema, određenog odlička koji je imao semantički kodiranu a prepoznatljivu vrijednost u komu- nikacijskim odnosima kultura i estetika velikoga prostora. Osobe koje su ga posjedovale morale su imati izuzetan status kulnog, magičnog ili sakralnog karaktera za vrijeme velikih promjena s početkom starijeg željeznog doba. Naime, datacije iz ostava obli- žnjeg zapadnobalkanskog zaleđa, i sada iz šireg prostora *Caput Adriae*, mjerodavne su i vrijedeće za 9. i rano 8. stoljeće izrazito željeznodobnog kulturno-kronološkog konteksta. Tako je izrazi- ta semantičko-semiotička razina pojedinih predmeta u sustavu vrijednosti različitih kulturnih i društvenih poredaka<sup>487</sup> nastavila dobro utemeljenu tradiciju *kulturne koiné* iz kasnog brončanog

Apart from the *Caput Adriae* type, also a Picenian (type II), a Dinaric (type III) and a Vergina type (type IV) can be distinguished, whose distribution demonstrates, despite their similarities, an individual- ised aesthetics, i.e. local characteristics of the production, the way of wearing and the deposition of these items as a group of jewelry, which was ideologically and semantically present in the attire of a broad cultural territory (fig. 63). The phalerae from *Caput Adriae* and its hinterland show that they were not present exclusively in materi- ally exposed and rich assemblages of attire of deceased women, but that they must have belonged to distinguished individuals of a much higher status than common people, most probably higher than the very top of the local aristocracy where it belonged. Therefore, an exceptional value is attributed to the signs coded in the ornaments of all identified types of phalerae, being small artifacts but with a broad narrative content.<sup>485</sup> As transmitters of specific symbolic infor- mation, i.e. as means of communication, they were mainly attributed an astral, solar or cosmological emphasis, which is why, in the sense of multiple interpretations of their metaphor, they could also have the role of a protective, apotropaic and prophylactic, magical and metaphysical amulet.<sup>486</sup> With the systematic analysis it was realized that such items of female attribution appeared in all respects as media with emblematic value, presenting specific characteristics which had a coded and recognizable semantic value in the commu- nication relations of cultures and aesthetics across a large area. Those who owned them must have had an exceptional religious, magical or sacral status in the turbulent period of the beginning of the Early Iron Age. In fact, the dating of the hoards from the close western Balkan hinterland and the broader territory of *Caput Adriae* shows their presence in the 9<sup>th</sup> and early 8<sup>th</sup> centuries with a clear cultural and chronological context of the Iron Age. They demonstrate that the expressly semantical - semiotic level of individual artifacts in the

<sup>485</sup> Knappett 2012.

<sup>486</sup> Hansen 1994: 258-261, 269, usp. Preucel 2006: 84-85.

<sup>487</sup> Npr. Kienlin 2005; Preucel 2006; Eggert 2010.

<sup>485</sup> Knappett 2012.

<sup>486</sup> Hansen 1994: 258-261, 269, Comp. Preucel 2006: 84-85.



**Slika 64.** Osorska amfora (kat. 100) (prema Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013).

**Figure 64.** The amphora from Osor (cat. 100) (after Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013).

doba od Alpa preko Jadrana i Balkana sve do Egeje (sl. 60; 63).<sup>488</sup>

U istome pravcu, sagledavanje "slike" regionalnih, a interkulturnih kontakata s kontinentalnim kompleksom KPŽ na prostoru kvarnerske regije upotpunit će i novi primjer tzv. osorske amfore (kat. 100, sl. 64). Riječ je o nalazu koji potječe iz temeljnih struktura zidnog kompleksa, novo istraživana benediktinskog samostana s crkvom sv. Petra u Osoru.<sup>489</sup> Posuda je bikonično oblikovanog tijela, visokog stožastog vrata, tipološki klasificirana kao amfora sa dvije ručke, nađena u funkciji urne. Njezine oblikovne i stilske odlike ne nalaze bližih paralela u usporednoj građi obližnjeg kulturnog prostora, istarskih, notranjskih, japodskih ili liburnskih nekropola. No zato joj se odgovarajuće paralele glede standardizirane forme tijela, naglašavanja izvijenog oboda i facetiranja prijelaza vrata u ramena te izvedbe karakterističnog ukrasnog motiva urezanih tankih linija, mogu vidjeti kod posuda koje su se koristile u istoj namjeni, na prilično udaljenom području ruške skupine mlađe faze KPŽ. Tako u formalnom smislu najbolje analogije nalazimo kod različitih tipova posuda iz nekropola Maribora, Ruša i Pobrežja. Međutim, među primjercima tzv. ruških amfora valja izdvojiti nekoliko pojedinačnih nalaza iz Pobrežja<sup>490</sup> te nalaz amfora iz groba 23,<sup>491</sup> i pogotovo iz groba 89 starije ruške nekropole.<sup>492</sup> Unatoč morfološkim sličnostima, osorska se amfora ipak donekle razlikuje od navedenih primjeraka, pogotovo glede veličine, jer je amfora iz groba 23 minijaturnih dimenzija, dok ona iz groba 89, koja najviše odgovara veličinom posude, ima pak nešto znatnije, tj. trbušastije zaobljeno tijelo i blago izdignutu *omfalos* stopu. U istom smislu može se tako redati brojne druge primjerke iz navedenih nalazišta. Ali ukratko, prema tipološkoj shemi amfora ruškog tipa koju je izradio Matija Črešnar, osorska se amfora može usporediti s njegovim najbrojnijim tzv. I. tipom amfora s visokim stožastim vratom, varijante s naglašenijim prijelazom iz vrata u

system of values of different cultural and social orders<sup>487</sup> continued the well founded tradition of the *cultural koiné* of the Late Bronze Age from the Alps, northern Italy and the western Balkans all the way to the Aegean (fig. 60; 63).<sup>488</sup>

Following the same direction, the observation of the big "picture" of regional and intercultural contacts with the continental complex of the Urnfield culture on the region of Kvarner will be complemented by the new example of the so called amphora from Osor (cat. 100, fig. 64). It was discovered during the research excavations in the monastery and church of St. Peter in Osor.<sup>489</sup> The vessel has a byconical form with an accentuated transition from the rounded shoulder into the conical neck, typologically classified as an amphora of a larger volume which was used as an urn. Formal and stylistic characteristics of the Osor amphora have no close comparisons in the regional ceramic production. Such finds are unknown among the ceramic inventories of the Istrian, Japodian and Liburnian necropolis. However, there are corresponding comparisons with respect to the standardized morphology of the vessels body, the accentuated everted rim and the faceted transition from the neck into the shoulder of the vessel, as well as the incised motive of two thin lines on the vessels. They can be observed in the vessels used for the same purpose in the Ruše group of the younger phase of the Urnfield culture. In the formal sense we can observe the best comparisons in different types of amphorae from the necropolis of Maribor, Ruše and Pobrežje. Among the examples of the so called amphorae of the Ruše type, several examples from Pobrežje<sup>490</sup> should be singled out, and the discovery of the amphora from grave 23,<sup>491</sup> and in particular that of grave 89 from the old necropolis in Ruše (Ruše I).<sup>492</sup>

Despite morphological similarities, in its final forming the amphora from Osor still differs from the mentioned examples, mostly with respect to their sizes. In fact, the amphora from grave 23 is a very small one,

<sup>488</sup> Usp. Blečić Kavur 2012a; Blečić Kavur 2012b; Blečić Kavur 2012c.

<sup>489</sup> Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013.

<sup>490</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 123: 16; Pahič 1972: T. 33: 11; T. 34: 3 itd.

<sup>491</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 108O.

<sup>492</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 111C, 9.

<sup>487</sup> For example Kienlin 2005; Preucel 2006; Eggert 2010.

<sup>488</sup> Comp. Blečić Kavur 2012a; Blečić Kavur 2012b; Blečić Kavur 2012c.

<sup>489</sup> Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013.

<sup>490</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 123: 16; Pahič 1972: T. 33: 11; T. 34: 3 etc.

<sup>491</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 108O.

<sup>492</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 111C, 9.

rame posude<sup>493</sup> koje se, kao odlika mlađih oblika, povezuju uz relativnu Ruše II kulturnu fazu i sinkroniziraju uz HaB2 stupanj.<sup>494</sup> Takvoj će dataciji opravdano poslužiti upravo istaknuti grob 89 iz prve ruške nekropole gdje se, pored kolutastog nakita te dugačkih saltaleona, kao tipičan element garniture ženske nošnje nalazila i sedlasta fibula tipa Ruše. Karakteristična je za mlađu fazu KPŽ, jer iako njezina pojava kao i kulturna rasprostranjenost u bližem i širem prostoru započinje već u bogatom razdoblju HaA2/B1 horizonta, bit će obilježjem čitavog HaB, posebice njegovog HaB2 stupnja ili druge polovine 10. i početka 9. stoljeća.<sup>495</sup> S obzirom na to, S. Pabst smatra navedenu fibulu oznakom ranoželjeznodobne ženske nošnje na širem prostoru od jugozapadne Panonije do istočnoalpskog prostora. Slijedom navedenog, nema veće prepreke da i raširenu pojavu takvog tipa amfora u ruškoj skupini razmatramo u aspektu novih kulturoloških strujanja na prijelazu posljednjeg tisućljeća stare ere. U istom kontekstu razmatrana je, naime, i osorska amfora, tj. povezana je uz isti vremenski horizont, ne samo glede tipoloških odlika i analiziranja arheološkom metodom, nego nam njezinu najvjerojatniju starost u rasponu između 950. i 900. godine podržavaju i podatci dobiveni radiometrijskim mjerenjem, 2735 ±35 godina BP (Poz-34654).<sup>496</sup>

Usprkos brojnim sličnostima u osnovnim oblikovnim karakteristikama, kako je opisano, primjerak osorske amfore se i udaljuje od ruških amfora (sl. 64). Ispostavlja, naime, specifičnu mjesnu maniru izradbe prema dobro poznatom uzorku ili prema određenoj čvrsto ukorijenjenoj tradiciji, kao nadahnućem za izvedbu takvih keramografskih oblika na prilično udaljenom zemljopisnom teritoriju kao što je Osor. Time se također valja shvatiti pojedinačna sahrana pojedinaca, zatečena na iznimno važnom trgovačkom i posredničkom punktu kvarnerskog otočja koja se, shodno mogućnostima i prilikama, pokopavala u svom ritualu na svoj tradicionalno prepoznatljiv način. Situacija se svakako ne može obrazlagati slučajnošću, pa i s ovim primjerom moramo sve više uvažavati dotoke iz kontinentalnih kultura KPŽ i u svjetlu promatranja mlađih razdoblja, tj. i za prijelaza na starije željezno doba na Kvarneru.

Iz prostora ruškog i pogotovo dobovskog kulturnog kruga KPŽ, kako smo vidjeli, penetrirali su snažni utjecaji ne samo do "kvarnerskog mora", već i do škocjanskog područja (ili škocjanskog *facies*)<sup>497</sup> "trščanskog mora". Naočalaste su fibule tako iznimno dobro zastupljene na nekropoli Brežec kao i nekropoli S. Barbara, Elleri. Od brežečkih grobova treba s jedne strane izdvojiti već komentirani grob 272, gdje je naočalasta fibula zabilježena s lučnom fibulom sa dva dugmeta na luku japodske varijante i s ulomkom željeznoga noža,<sup>498</sup> a s druge strane bogati grob 155, s čitavim setom naočalastih fibula uz ostalu nakitnu garnituru, među kojim se našla i narukvica dvoslovnog presjeka, uz prilog

whereas the example from grave 89, which is of a comparable size, has a slightly smaller and more rounded body with a slightly elevated omphalos shaped base. In the same sense, numerous other examples from the mentioned sites could be counted and lined up. However, according to the typological classification of the amphorae of the Ruše type, created by Matija Črešnar, the example from Osor should be compared to the most numerous group – the so called first group of amphorae with a high conical neck, more precisely, the variant with an accentuated transition from the shoulder into the neck of the vessel.<sup>493</sup> Such forms are a characteristic of the younger forms of amphorae, which could be linked to the relative Ruše II phase, and synchronized with the HaB2 phase.<sup>494</sup> Such a dating can be supported by the aforementioned grave 89, from the necropolis in Ruše, along with the ring jewelry and long saltaleoni, as a typical element of the garniture of female attire, also a saddle-like shaped fibula of the Ruše type was discovered. It is a find characteristic of the younger phase of the Urnfield culture, although its appearance and its distribution in the surrounding territories start already in the wealthy period of the HaA2/B1 horizon. It will remain characteristic for the HaB and it is especially the trade mark of its phase HaB2 or the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>495</sup> Taking into consideration the abovementioned, Sabine Pabst considers this type of fibula as a part of the Early Iron Age attire spread on the broad area from southwestern Pannonia reaching the southern Alpine territory. Therefore, there are no major obstacles to considering the appearance of this type of amphorae of the Ruše group as new cultural movements at the turn of the last millennium BC.

Within the same context of consideration, the amphora from Osor was linked to the same chronological horizon – not only based on its morphological characteristics and archaeological inference, but also based on the radiometric dating which demonstrated an age most probably between 950 and 900 BC (Poz-34654 - 2735 ±35 BP).<sup>496</sup>

Despite the numerous similarities present in the basic formal characteristics as noted above, the example of the Osor amphora also slightly departs from the amphorae of the Ruše type (fig. 64). With its unique appearance, it can be perceived as a specific local manner of production, based on well-known patterns or a specific deeply-rooted tradition, and as an inspiration for producing such pottery forms on a distant geographic territory, as was the case of Osor. Of course, it is in that way that the discovered urn has to be conceived as the burial of an individual, or a family, caught in an extremely important trade and interference location of the Kvarner archipelago, which, according to the opportunities and possibilities, was buried according to his ritual in his traditional recognizable way. It is by no means that this situation could be explained as accidental, and it is by bearing in mind also this example that the influences by continental Urnfield cultures should be paid more attention also when considering earlier periods, i.e. from the Late Bronze Age into the Early Iron Age on the Kvarner territory.

As we have seen, strong influences from the area of the continental Urnfield cultural circle, in particular from Ruše and Dobova, reached the "Kvarner Sea", but also to the area of Škocjan (or the *Škocjan facies*) and to the "Triest Sea".<sup>497</sup> Thus, spectacle fibulae are numerously present on

<sup>493</sup> Črešnar 2006: 123, 129, Fig. 28.

<sup>494</sup> Kaerner 1989: 223-225; Pare 1998: 343-345, Fig. 25: 33; Črešnar 2006: 129.

<sup>495</sup> Pabst-Dörrer 2000: 28-29, K. 3,1; Pabst 2008: 624-626, Fig. 13; Ložnjak Dizdar 2009: 160-161; Pabst 2012: 233, f.n. 780, K. 34,1.

<sup>496</sup> Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013: Fig. 5.

<sup>497</sup> Montagnari Kokelj 1997: 146-147; Teržan 1999: 138. Vidjeti i P. Turk 1994: 152-156, koji kritizira stajališta glede pripisivanja škocjanskih nalazišta i okolice notranjskoj skupini, ali ne komentira mogućnost njihova interpretiranja unutar istarske skupine što je pak bila zamisao Š. Batovića (1987b). I unatoč tomu škocjansko se područje i dalje može naći u literaturi kao dio Notranjske skupine (npr. Sakara Sučević 2004).

<sup>498</sup> Steffé de Piero 1977: T. XXIII: T. 272. O željeznim noževima Blečić Kavur 2012a: 102-103; Trampuž Orel 2012: 21-23, Fig. 3. Čini se prihvatljivim upravo preko ovog groba i početak korištenja naočalastih fibula na tim prostorima vidjeti i nešto ranije od uobičajenog.

<sup>493</sup> Črešnar 2006: 123, 129, Fig. 28.

<sup>494</sup> Kaerner 1989: 223-225; Pare 1998: 343-345, Fig. 25: 33; Črešnar 2006: 129.


<sup>495</sup> Pabst-Dörrer 2000: 28-29, K. 3,1; Pabst 2008: 624-626, Fig. 13; Ložnjak Dizdar 2009: 160-161; Pabst 2012: 233, f.n. 780, K. 34,1.

<sup>496</sup> Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013: Fig. 5.

<sup>497</sup> Montagnari Kokelj 1997: 146-147; Teržan 1999: 138. See also P. Turk 1994: 152-156, criticizing the point of view attributing the Škocjan sites to the Notranjska group. But he does not comment the possibility of their interpretation in the frameworks of the Istrian group as it was suggested by Š. Batović (1987b). Despite his reaction the area of Škocjan is still considered in literature to be a







**Slika 65.** Inventar groba 96 iz nekropole Colombare, Gazzo Veronese (prema Salzani 2001).

**Figure 65.** Inventory of grave number 96 from the necropolis in Colombara, Gazzo Veronese (after Salzani 2001).

i fragmentiran nož, ulomak jezičastog srpa i konjskih žvala (sl. 61).<sup>499</sup> Međutim, značajno je i to da se na obje nekropole pojavljuju dvojno-križne pojasne kopče varijante Ljubljana<sup>500</sup> koje su, baš u kombinaciji s naočalastim fibulama tipa Haslau-Regelsbrunn, znakovitim dijelom (ženske) nošnje ljubljanske nekropole dvorišća SAZU, grobovi 39, 316, 319? i 323,<sup>501</sup> obilježavajući time l.b razvojnu fazu ljubljanske skupine.<sup>502</sup> Vrlo je slična situacija poznata i kod bogatog groba 7 iz Ormoža,<sup>503</sup> koji pak u kulturno-povijesnom smislu implicira sasvim drugu i daljnju diskusiju.<sup>504</sup>

Ponavljanje određenih kombinacija nošnje i nakita prepoznaje se, dakle, najčešće kod grobova ženskih pokojnica. Tako je asocijacija fibule i kopče svojstvena grobovima ženskih pokojnica dobovske skupine, pa ih nalazimo u grobu 2 nekropole Bršljin iz Novega mesta<sup>505</sup> i posebno u grobu 108 nekropole u Dobovi.<sup>506</sup> Potonji je grob izuzetno atraktivan budući da sadrži i još jedan prepoznatljiv element nošnje – lučnu fibulu sa spiralnim diskom na nozi. Po svim karakteristikama ta fibula, iako sniženog luka, ima najbližu paralelu kod fibula iz groba 1 nekropole na Klačnici, kojima je spiralni disk na nozi odlomljen, a luk im je ukrašen urezanim poprečnim linijama (kat. 181-182).<sup>507</sup> Tim dobro poznatim pri-

the necropolis of Brežec, as well as on the necropolis of S. Barbara at Elleri. From Brežec, the already mentioned grave 272 must be singled out on the one hand, where a spectacle fibula was discovered together with a bow fibula with two knobs on the bow of the Japodian type and the fragments of an iron knife,<sup>498</sup> and on the other hand the rich grave 155 with a complete set of spectacle fibulae and other pieces of jewelry containing also a bracelet with a double-pitch cross-section and grave goods among which a fragmented knife, a fragment of a sickle with a tongue shaped handle and fragments of horse bits were discovered (fig. 61).<sup>499</sup> However, it is important also to note that both necropoles contained double-cross belt buckles of the Ljubljana variant<sup>500</sup> which were, in combination with spectacle fibulae of the Haslau-Regelsbrunn type a significant element of (female) attire at the Ljubljana necropolis on the courtyard of the SAZU – they were discovered in graves 39, 316, 319? and 323<sup>501</sup> signifying the l.b phase of development of the Ljubljana cultural group.<sup>502</sup> A similar situation is known from the rich grave 7 from Ormož,<sup>503</sup> which in a cultural and historical context implicates a completely different and distant discussion.<sup>504</sup>

The recurrence of certain combinations of attire and jewelry can be recognized most frequently in female graves. Still, such a combination is significant for the graves of the Dobova group – we can observe them

<sup>499</sup> Vitri 1977: T. XIII-XV; Teržan 2001: 91.

<sup>500</sup> Vitri 1977: T. XVII: T. 168: 1; Montagnari Kokelj 1997: T. 25: G. 36.

<sup>501</sup> Starè 1954: T. XXXV-XXXVI; Puš 1982: T. 25: 2, 7; T. 27: 7, 9; T. 30: 5-7.

<sup>502</sup> Gabrovec 1975: 342-343; Teržan 1990b: 79, K. 3.

<sup>503</sup> Tomanič-Jevremov 1988: T. 9; Tomanič-Jevremov 1989: T. 15-16; Teržan 1990b: 23, 78-79.

<sup>504</sup> Raspravu na tu temu vidjeti kod Teržan 1990b: 22, 63.

<sup>505</sup> Križ 1995: 30-31: kat. 7-8.

<sup>506</sup> Starè 1960; Starè 1975: T. 18: 108.

<sup>507</sup> Brunšmid 1901: T. I: 4, 11; Batović 1970: K. 2; Glogović 1989: 19, T. 17: 1; Glogović 2003: 16, T. 10: 55, T. 10: 68. D. Glogović ističe te fibule kao tipične forme kasnog brončanog, odnosno početnog željeznog doba na prostoru sjeverne i srednje Dalmacije (Glogović 2003: 17), iako lučnih fibula s diskom

part of the Notranjska group (e.g. Sakara Sučević 2004).

<sup>498</sup> Steffè de Piero 1977: T. XXIII: T. 272. For iron knives see Blečić Kavr 2012a: 102-103; Trampuž Orel 2012: 21-23, Fig. 3. It seems acceptable that due to the dating of this grave we can assume the beginning of use of spectacle fibulae to be dated a little bit earlier.

<sup>499</sup> Vitri 1977: T. XIII-XV; Teržan 2001: 91.

<sup>500</sup> Vitri 1977: T. XVII: T. 168: 1; Montagnari Kokelj 1997: T. 25: G. 36.

<sup>501</sup> Starè 1954: T. XXXV-XXXVI; Puš 1982: T. 25: 2, 7; T. 27: 7, 9; T. 30: 5-7.

<sup>502</sup> Gabrovec 1975: 342-343; Teržan 1990b: 79, K. 3.

<sup>503</sup> Tomanič-Jevremov 1988: T. 9; Tomanič-Jevremov 1989: T. 15-16; Teržan 1990b: 23, 78-79.

<sup>504</sup> See Teržan 1990b: 22, 63.

mjercima pridružuje se i ulomak fibule iz Osora (kat. 59), namjerno deformiran i oštećen, ali s očuvanim prepoznatljivim elementima fibule poput: dio spiralno izvijene nožice, na koju se nastavljao spiralno namotani disk te žica luka s djelomično vidljivim urezanim ukrasima. Navedeni tip fibule emanantan je oblik nošnje Apeninskog poluotoka odakle se pomorskim pravcima eksportirao na suprotnu jadransku obalu. Najbliže primjerke klaćeničkim fibulama možemo vidjeti u nekropoli Colombare, Gazzo Veronese posebno kod bogatog ženskog groba 96, koji je apsolutno dosta nisko datiran u 9. stoljeće (sl. 65).<sup>508</sup> Analogno je datirana i fibula iz naselja Villamarzana kod Roviga,<sup>509</sup> a obje su uspoređivane s fibulama iz grobova nekropole San Vitale, također kronološki opredijeljenima I. stupnju villanovske kulture (ili Bologna I),<sup>510</sup> s mogućnošću trajanja čak i do početnog 8. stoljeća.<sup>511</sup> Brojnost sukladnih primjeraka kod nekropole Terni, gdje su vremenskim obilježjem njezine II. faze, detaljno je prikazala D. Glogović,<sup>512</sup> kao i njihov značaj pojavljivanja kod srednjoitalskih ostava (Campese, Goluzzo, Piediluco itd.). Ondje su te fibule postavljene kao jedan od vodećih elemenata BF3 ili kasnog protovillanovskog horizonta i početnog željeznog doba (PF1).<sup>513</sup> Stoga ne postoje nikakve zapreke da se u istom vremenskom okviru promatraju lučne fibule iz Klaćenice, što je uostalom i datacijska odrednica koju pruža grob 108 iz Dobove, odnosno grob 155 iz Brežeca (sl. 61).<sup>514</sup>

Grob 96 iz Colombare rijedak je primjer darovanih elemenata ženske nošnje neoštećenih gorenjem (sl. 65),<sup>515</sup> gdje su združeni različiti tipovi lučnih fibula s različito ukrašenim lukom (tordiranjem, pseudotordiranjem, urezivanjem), a može poslužiti i kao dobra paralela za malu lučnu fibulu iz Klaćenice, kojoj noga nije sačuvana u cijelosti (kat. 187), i manju fibulu iz područja Rijeke (kat. 128).<sup>516</sup> Za razliku od fibule iz Klaćenice koja ima sasvim tordirani luk, od opruge do noge, i usko raskovanu nožicu, fibula iz Rijeke ima blago raskovanu nožicu a luk joj nije u potpunosti tordiran. Budući da te dvije fibule pokazuju i određene različitosti, fibuli iz Klaćenice najbolje paralele možemo naći kod fibula iz nekropola i ostava venetskog područja i padske nizine, npr. iz S. Giorgio di Angarano, Frattesine, Borgo S. Zeno, Narde itd.,<sup>517</sup> a fibuli iz Rijeke na području Verone i protogolaseških nalazišta, npr. Colombara, Bissone (Pavia), Morano sul Po itd.<sup>518</sup> U svojim

in grave 2 of the necropolis Bršljin in Novo mesto<sup>505</sup> and especially in grave 108 in Dobova.<sup>506</sup> The latter is especially attractive since it includes a further significant element of attire – a bowed fibula with a spiral disc on the foot! Taking into consideration all the characteristics of this fibula, although with a slightly lower bow, we can observe the best parallels in form of the fibula from grave 1 in Klaćenica, where the spiral disc was broken away and the bow was decorated with incised oblique lines (cat. 181-182).<sup>507</sup> The fibula fragment from Osor can be added to these well-known examples (cat. 59). The fragment is intentionally deformed and damaged, but the recognizable fibula elements have been preserved, including a part of the spirally bent foot which continued into the spirally rolled-up disc and a wire from the bow with partly visible incised ornaments. The given type is a typical element of the attire of the Apennine area, from where it was exported across the sea to the other side of the Adriatic shore. The closest examples to the fibula from Klaćenica can be observed at the necropolis of Colombara, Gazzo Veronese, in particular at the rich female grave 96, which was absolutely dated relatively late into the 9<sup>th</sup> century (fig. 65).<sup>508</sup> Identical was the dating of the fibula from the settlement Villamarzana near Rovigo,<sup>509</sup> and both fibulae were compared to examples from the graves of the necropolis of San Vitale which were also chronologically attributed to the I. phase of the Villanova culture (or Bologna I)<sup>510</sup> with a possibility of lasting into the beginning of the 8<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>511</sup> A large number of corresponding finds from the necropolis of Terni, where they were chronologically dated into its II. phase, was presented in detail by D. Glogović<sup>512</sup> who also stressed their occurrence in hoards on the territory of central Italy (Campese, Goluzzo, Piediluco etc.). There, these fibulae were listed as one of the leading elements of the BF3 or the late Protovillanovan horizon and the Early Iron Age (PF1).<sup>513</sup> Therefore, there are no major obstacles to observing within the same chronological frame also the bow fibulae from Klaćenica, which is also the chronological position of grave 108 from Dobova and graves 272 and 155 from Brežec (fig. 61).<sup>514</sup>

Grave 96 from the Colombara necropolis is a rare example of female grave goods not damaged by the funeral pyre (fig. 65),<sup>515</sup> where different examples of bow fibulae with differently decorated bows were united in a single grave (with twisted, pseudo twisted and incised

na nozi osim primjeraka iz Klaćenice uopće ne postoji. Datira ih široko u 10. i 9. stoljeće, pri čemu je odlučujući kriterij način ukrašavanja luka, urezivanje ili tordiranje, što je uostalom bio i razlog da te fibule tipološki dijeli, negirajući tako atribut više razine kao što je forma i tehnologija izradbe, ali čak i jedinstvo jedine pouzdanije grobne cjeline iz Klaćenice. Jedna lučna fibula s diskom na nozi potječe iz Ljupča. Međutim, tipološki se razlikuje od fibula iz Klaćenice, jer je dvodijelna i plosnato raskovanog diska. Smještena je u I. fazu željeznog doba Liburnije i okarakterizirana kao degenerirani, vjerojatno, domaći proizvod po uzoru na italske primjerke (Glogović 1997: 34, T. I: 2)?

<sup>508</sup> Salzani 2001: 93, Fig. 16A.

<sup>509</sup> Salzani, Consonni 2005: 25, T. 15: 28.

<sup>510</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 60: C1; Pincelli, Morigi Govi 1975: Fig. 70: 8; Dore 2005: 260, T. 2.

<sup>511</sup> Eles Masi 1986: 56; Naso 2003: 21.

<sup>512</sup> Glogović 1989: 19; usp. Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 42; T. 43; T. 44; T. 45.

<sup>513</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1999: T. 31, 32, 33; Leonelli 2003: 212-213, 281-282, Fig. 40: Fig. 69

<sup>514</sup> Š. Batović ih datira u I. fazu liburnske kulture 9. stoljeća (Batović 1981: 99, 110, kat. 95, 171, Sl. 8: 2).

<sup>515</sup> Salzani 2001: 93, 101.

<sup>516</sup> Glogović 1989: T. 17: 1-3; Glogović 2003: 16-17, T. 10: 58.

<sup>517</sup> Bianchin Citton 1984: 631; De Min 1984: 657, T. II: 1-2; Eles Masi 1986: T. 4; Salzani 1987; Bianchin Citton 1998: 284-285, Fig. 10: 4; Salzani 1991: Fig. 45: 2-3; Carancini, Peroni 1999: 62, T. 30; 32.

<sup>518</sup> Eles Masi 1986: T. 5; Salzani 2001: Fig. 16: 10, Fig. 19: A3; De Marinis 1972: 66-69, T. VIII: 1-6. Iznenadjujuća sličnost uočljiva je kod takve fibule iz groba

<sup>505</sup> Križ 1995: 30-31: cat. 7-8.

<sup>506</sup> Starè 1960; Starè 1975: T. 18: 108.

<sup>507</sup> Brunšmid 1901: T. I: 4, 11; Batović 1970: K. 2; Glogović 1989: 19, T. 17: 1; Glogović 2003: 16, T. 10: 55, T. 10: 68. D. Glogović points out these fibulae as typical forms of the Late Bronze Age and the beginning of the Early Iron Age on the territory of northern and central Dalmatia (Glogović 2003: 17), although bowed fibulae with a disc on the foot, except for the find from Klaćenica, do not exist. She dates them into the 10<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> century based on the criterion of the decoration of the bow which was actually the reason for their typological distinction. With this decision she denied the differences in higher attributes such as the form and technology of production and also the unity of the only reliable grave from Klaćenica. One bowed fibula with a disc on the foot comes from Ljubač – but it is typologically different from the find from Klaćenica, since it is composed of two parts and has a flat hammered disc. It was dated into the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the Iron Age of Liburnia and characterized as a degenerated, most probably, local product based on Italian models (Glogović 1997: 34, T. I: 2).

<sup>508</sup> Salzani 2001: 93, Fig. 16A.

<sup>509</sup> Salzani, Consonni 2005: 25, T. 15: 28.

<sup>510</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 60: C1; Pincelli, Morigi Govi 1975: Fig. 70; Dore 2005: 260, T. 2.

<sup>511</sup> Eles Masi 1986: 56; Naso 2003: 21.

<sup>512</sup> Glogović 1989: 19; comp. Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 42; T. 43; T. 44; T. 45.

<sup>513</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1999: T. 31, 32, 33; Leonelli 2003: 212-213, 281-282, Fig. 40: Fig. 69.

<sup>514</sup> Š. Batović dated them in to the I. phase of the Liburnian culture from the 9<sup>th</sup> century (Batović 1981: 99, 110, cat. 95; 171, Sl. 8: 2).

<sup>515</sup> Salzani 2001: 93, 101.

različitim varijantama, od alpskog i srednjomediteranskog pa sve do egejskog kulturnog kruga, pojava tog oblika fibule kronološki je sinkronizirana u vrijeme BF2/3 i u submikensko razdoblje.<sup>519</sup> U kontinuitetu posebno vrijednim čini se istaknuti grobove iz nekropole Terni, grob 1, 116, 130, 135 itd., gdje su identične fibule nađene u kombinaciji s lučnim fibulama sa spiralnim diskom na nozi, zatim s lučnim fibulama sa spiralnim lukom i sa zmijastim dvodijelnim fibulama.<sup>520</sup> Slično kao i u Kampaniji i Laciju, odnosno kao i na prostoru sjeverne Italije, ti grobovi predstavljaju krajnju fazu BF3 i začetak PF1, i apsolutno su datirani u drugu polovinu 10. stoljeća.<sup>521</sup> U tom vremenskom i kulturološkom kontekstu možda treba promatrati i malu lučnu fibulu s uskom nožicom iz Novalje, Dabovi stanovi (kat. 42), koja iz čitavog nalaza treba biti povezana s ulomcima zmijaste fibule (kat. 41).<sup>522</sup>

Na obližnjem prostoru te fibule nisu učestala pojava – samo tri primjerka poznata su iz Like i tri iz prostora Dalmacije. Istom su tipu pribrojene i fibule iz Tolmina, grob 119, IV. vrsta prema tipologiji A. Pogačnik,<sup>523</sup> te iz Brinjeve gore, grob 27.<sup>524</sup> Kvarnerskim fibulama srodni primjerci potječu s jedne strane iz Nezakcija<sup>525</sup> te s druge strane iz Brušana, grob 1, i iz Vrepca, tumul na Orlovom kamenu.<sup>526</sup> Kod potonjih se primjeraka također nalazi vrlo dobra paralela fibuli iz Rijeke, budući da obje imaju četvrtasto raskovan navoj petlje, što je zapravo odlika i podobne fibule iz groba 24 ninske nekropole. Ona je niže datirana jer je, između ostalog, dokumentirana zajedno sa dvije višedijelne naočalaste fibule, s lučnom fibulom s jantaram na luku i s iglom koničnog oblika glavice.<sup>527</sup> Unatoč boljim okolnostima niti fibule iz područja Like ne pružaju sigurnijih datacijskih oslonaca i mogu se samo okvirno odrediti u širi vremenski raspon trajanja, kasnobrončanog i ranog željeznog doba,<sup>528</sup> dok su ninski primjerci kronološki određeni II.A fazi liburnske kulture.<sup>529</sup> Općenito su lučne fibule s tordiranim (pa i pseudotordiranim) lukom sa sjevernodalmatinskih nalazišta datirane u 9. i 8. stoljeće.<sup>530</sup> Novim razmatranjem gradiva te su fibule istaknute kao tipični oblici kasnog brončanog i početnog željeznog doba na istočnoj jadranskoj obali, iako ih je poznato svega nekoliko, a datirane su znatno više u 10. i 9. stoljeće.<sup>531</sup> Međutim,

bows), and they can serve as a comparison to the small bow fibula from Klačenica, whose foot has not been entirely preserved (cat. 187) and a smaller fibula from the territory of Rijeka (cat. 128).<sup>516</sup> As opposed to the fibula from Klačenica, whose bow is entirely twisted from the spring to the foot, and a narrowly hammered foot, the fibula from Rijeka (cat. 128) presents a hammered foot but its bow is not entirely twisted throughout its length. Since they also present a certain degree of differences, the best comparisons to the fibula from Klačenica can be found in necropoles and hoards of the Veneto region and the Po plain – for example from S. Giorgio di Angarano, Frattesina, Borgo S. Zeno, Narde etc.,<sup>517</sup> whereas the best comparisons to the fibula from Rijeka can be found on the territory around Verona and on the Protogolasecca sites, as for example Colombara, Bissone (Pavia), Morano sul Po etc.<sup>518</sup> In its different forms, on the territory from the Alpine area and the central Mediterranean and all the way to the Aegean cultural area, the appearance of these fibulae is chronologically synchronized into the BF2/3 and submycenaean period.<sup>519</sup> As an uninterrupted continuity it is worth mentioning graves numbers 1, 116, 130 and others from the necropolis of Terni, where identical fibulae were discovered together in combination with bow fibulae with a spiral disc on the foot, with bowed fibulae with a spiral bow and together with two-part serpentine fibulae.<sup>520</sup> Similarly to Campania and Latium, as well as on the territory of northern Italy, these graves represent the final phase of BF3 and the initial PF1 and are absolutely dated into the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>521</sup> We should observe within the same cultural and chronological context also a small bow fibula with a narrow foot from Dabovi stanovi near Novalja (cat. 42), which from among all the finds should be associated to the fragments of a serpentine fibula (cat. 41).<sup>522</sup>

These fibulae are not a common find on the nearby territory – only three examples are known from Lika and other three from Dalmatia. Into the same type, or variant IV according to the typology by Ana Pogačnik, the fibulae from Tolmin, grave 119,<sup>523</sup> and from grave 27 from Brinjeva gora were included.<sup>524</sup> The examples similar to the finds from Kvarner come from Nesactium on one side,<sup>525</sup> and, on the other, from Brušani, grave 1, and Vrebac tumulus on Orlov kamen.<sup>526</sup> The latter contains also a very good parallel for the fibula from Rijeka since they both have a square forged coil of the spring – a feature marking also a similar fibula of grave

5/94 nekropole Morano sul Po, gdje je uz lučnu fibulu s urezanim ukrasom na luku nađen i ulomak zmijaste jednodijelne(?) fibule s rebrima, a grob je pouzdano datiran u Morano 3 fazu, odnosno obilježava kraj protogolaseške (IIIb) i početak golaseške faze, apsolutno određena u drugu polovinu 10. stoljeća korigirane periodizacije (HaB2) (Giaretti, Rubat Borel 2006: 93, Fig. 83; Gambari 2006: 203).

<sup>519</sup> Literatura na tu temu je ogromna. Vidjeti neke od važnijih ili novijih izdanja koja koriste i stariju bibliografiju: Müller-Karpe 1959: 199-200; Eles Masi 1986: 14-15, T. 3: 68, T. 4: 69-70, T. 5: ...; Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978: 49-51, T. 7: 179, 200; Carancini, Peroni 1999: Fig. 29, 30, 31, 32; Teßmann 2001: 47-48; Teržan 2002: 93; Gambari 2006: 200-203.

<sup>520</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 43; 44; Leonelli 2003: 82-84, 153-155, 162-164, 165-166...

<sup>521</sup> Bietti Sestieri 1992: 93, Fig. 4.8; Pacciarelli 2001: 54, 60, Fig. 29, 32, 33.

<sup>522</sup> Batović 1973: T. 103: 1-2; Glogović 2003: 20, T. 12: 92.

<sup>523</sup> Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 22: 1; Pogačnik 2002: 30-31, Sl. 7.

<sup>524</sup> V. Pahić 1989: T. 1: 5. Toj se grupi vjerojatno pribraja i ulomak tordiranog luka fibule iz čuvenog groba 289 nekropole Dobove (Teržan 1995: 339; Teržan 2002: 93).

<sup>525</sup> Glogović 2003: T. 10: 59.

<sup>526</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1976: T. 8: 11; T. 9: 3; Glogović 1989: 19.

<sup>527</sup> Batović 1968: T. X; Batović 1976: Sl. 14; Hiller 1991: T. 21-22: 228-235; Glogović 2003: T. 10: 60.

<sup>528</sup> Teßmann 2001: 47-48.

<sup>529</sup> Batović 1981: 112, 99, Sl. 4: 2.

<sup>530</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: 429; Batović 1981: 17, 99, Sl. 4; Glogović 1989: 18-19, 41.

<sup>531</sup> Glogović 2003: 17. S obzirom na to da je kronologija liburnske skupine paralelizirana s italjskim kulturama (npr. Batović 1983; Batović 1987a), a sukladno nalazima importirane građe koji su ondje sasvim pouzdano datirani, I. faza

<sup>516</sup> Glogović 1989: T. 17: 1-3; Glogović 2003: 16-17, T. 10: 58.

<sup>517</sup> Bianchin Citton 1984: 631; De Min 1984: 657, T. II: 1-2; Eles Masi 1986: T. 4; Salzani 1987; Bianchin Citton 1998: 284-285, Fig. 10: 4; Salzani 1991: Fig. 45: 2-3; Carancini, Peroni 1999: 62, T. 30; 32.

<sup>518</sup> Eles Masi 1986: T. 5; Salzani 2001: Fig. 16: 10, Fig. 19: A3; De Marinis 1972: 66-69, T. VIII: 1-6. A surprising similarity can be observed in the fibula from grave 5/94 from Morano sul Po, where together with the bowed fibula with an incised ornament on the bow, a fragment of one-part serpentine fibulae with ribs was discovered. The grave is dated into the Morano 3 phase, which characterizes the end of Protogolasecca (IIIb) and the beginning of Golasecca phase which was dated in to the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century (HaB2) (Giaretti, Rubat Borel 2006: 93, Fig. 83; Gambari 2006: 203).

<sup>519</sup> This theme was discussed in a vast corpus of literature. It is recommended to see some important or recent publications listing also the older literature: Müller-Karpe 1959: 199-200; Eles Masi 1986: 14-15, T. 3: 68, T. 4: 69-70, T. 5: ...; Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978: 49-51, T. 7: 179, 200; Carancini, Peroni 1999: Fig. 29, 30, 31, 32; Teßmann 2001: 47-48; Teržan 2002: 93; Gambari 2006: 200-203.

<sup>520</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 43; 44; Leonelli 2003: 82-84, 153-155, 162-164, 165-166...

<sup>521</sup> Bietti Sestieri 1992: 93, Fig. 4.8; Pacciarelli 2001: 54, 60, Fig. 29, 32, 33.

<sup>522</sup> Batović 1973: T. 103: 1-2; Glogović 2003: 20, T. 12: 92.

<sup>523</sup> Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 22: 1; Pogačnik 2002: 30-31, Sl. 7.

<sup>524</sup> V. Pahić 1989: T. 1: 5. To this group most probably belongs also a fragment of a twisted bow of a fibula from the famous grave number 289 from the necropolis in Dobova (Teržan 1995: 339; Teržan 2002: 93).

<sup>525</sup> Glogović 2003: T. 10: 59.

<sup>526</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1976: T. 8: 11; T. 9: 3; Glogović 1989: 19.

već je B. Čović istaknuo razlike između tordiranog i pseudotordiranog luka, na kojima je temeljio eventualnu mogućnost njihove vremenske nekompatibilnosti. Time nije isključio potencijalnost ranog javljanja fibula s tordiranim lukom na prostoru istočnog Jadrana, koje su trebale biti istovremene s modom na prostoru Apenina, oslanjajući se pri tomu na datacije i argumente H. Müller-Karpea, i ostavivši ujedno otvorenom pretpostavku da su fibule pseudotordiranog luka možda ipak nešto mlađeg datuma od ovih prvih.<sup>532</sup>

Vremenski i kulturološki, tom okviru treba svrstati i lučnu fibulu s izdignutim lukom i ukrasom urezanih snopova paralelnih linija (kat. 186), koja je nađena u istom grobu na Klačenicima kao i prethodna fibula.<sup>533</sup> Usporedbe s japodskim lučnim fibulama grupe B<sup>534</sup> prema R. Drechsler-Bižić formalna je, ali ne i u potpunosti zadovoljavajuća, kao što niti datacija u 9. stoljeće<sup>535</sup> ne može biti u potpunosti prihvatljiva. Visoko oblikovanim lukom, oprugom i relativno usko raskucanom nogom, bez ikakvih dodatnih ukrasa, ta će klačenička fibula više odgovarati sjevernoitalskim i protogolaseškim primjercima, upravo kao i primjerku iz tolminske nekropole,<sup>536</sup> gdje su istovremeno i sinkronizirano datirane u stupanj BF.<sup>537</sup> Slijedom istaknutog, lučne fibule iz Rijeke i Klačenice treba vidjeti u neposrednoj ili posrednoj povezanosti s italskim prostorom, vremenski ih odrediti u početke 10. stoljeća, ako ne već i na kraj 11. stoljeća, a razumijevati kao doista aktivan čimbenik određene poruke (ženskog simbola) u živom cirkuliranju kulturne *koiné*, koji na vrhuncu ekspanzije, u vrijeme HaB1-B2, teritorij istočnog dijela sjevernoga Jadrana ni po tom elementu nije zaobišao.

S opisanim se fibulama može dovesti u vezu i još jedan ulomak male, vrlo tanke tordirane ogrlice, četvrtastog presjeka, iz nekropole Klačenice (kat. 191).<sup>538</sup> Uporište za tu tezu pruža grob 393 iz

željeznog doba trebala bi otpočeti negdje u drugoj polovini 10. stoljeća, a II. faza u 9. stoljeću, što je neizravno sugerirala već i D. Glogović (1989: 40, Sl. 9). Inventar ninskog groba 24, najvjerojatnije dvojnog ukopa, treba, naime, datirati već u posljednja desetljeća 9. stoljeća, usp. Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014.

<sup>532</sup> Čović 1971a: 76. Budući da se D. Glogović poziva na citirani rad B. Čovića, i glede datacije i glede obilježja koje te fibule nose, njihovo izjednačavanje u gotovo istoj tipološkoj klasi, te tvrdnja da su to tipični oblici nošnje na prostoru Liburna i Delmata ne čini se realno prihvatljivom.

<sup>533</sup> Brunšmid 1901: 56-57, T. I: 6.

<sup>534</sup> Fibule imaju gladak luk s metopnim urezanim ukrasom, ali su znatno masivnije i/ili zdepastije građe, naglašeno raskovane nožice, koja je često dodatno ukrašavana. Podrijetlo tih fibula tražilo se u degeneriranoj (op.a!) evoluciji fibula u obliku violinskog gudala na sjeverozapadnom balkanskom području (Drechsler-Bižić 1976: 147-148).

<sup>535</sup> Glogović 1989: 18; Glogović 2003: 19.

<sup>536</sup> Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 93: 1; Pogačnik 2002: 30, Sl. 7; Teržan 2002: 93.

<sup>537</sup> Eles Masi 1986: 20-21, T. 7, 8; De Marinis 1972: T. XII: 2; De Marinis, Gambari 2005: 200-201, T. 5.

<sup>538</sup> Taj je ulomak u dosadašnjoj literaturi objavljan kao dio tordirane narukvice (Brunšmid 1901: 55, T. I: 8; Glogović 1989: 33, T. 35: 8) što prema dimenzijama i izradbi nije moguće prihvatiti. Isto tako, zbog masivnosti i načina oblikovanja tordirane žice, kao i raskucanih završetaka, odnosno dužine samoga tordiranja, usporedbe koje su implicirale dataciju, s ostavama iz prostora sjeverne Hrvatske (Glogović 1989: 33) nisu zadovoljavajuće. Možda bi eventualna sličnost bila vidljiva kod sitne tanke ogrlice iz Velike Gorice, iz groba 3/1916 (Vinski-Gasparini 1973: T. 104: 21), koja je tordirana do samoga uvijenoga završetka kao i ogrlice iz Klačenice i Tolmina. Isto tako, sličnost postoji i kod ogrlice iz Dalja, vinograd Pošćić grob 66 (Metzner-Nebelsick 2002: 445, T. 83: 11), koja, doduše, nije tordirana do samoga kraja, ali je gracilne izradbe i ima četvrtasti presjek tanko raskucane žice na krajevima. Napokon, vrlo se srodna paralela nalazi i kod male ogrlice iz svetišta Enodia, skupine Pherai (Kilian 1975: T. 65: 4). Zbog nedostatka podataka o nalaženju klačeničke ogrlice moguće je, nažalost, samo pretpostavljati radi li se možda o dječjoj ili djevojačkoj ogrlici? Možda im se može pridružiti i ulomak tordiranog torque-

24 from Nin. This example had a lower dating since it was discovered together with two composite spectacle fibulae, a bow fibula with amber on the bow, and a pin with a conically formed head.<sup>527</sup> Regardless of better discovery circumstances, neither the fibulae from Lika could be dated more precisely, and could only be approximately situated into a broader chronological range of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age,<sup>528</sup> whereas the examples from Nin were included into the II.A phase of the Liburnian culture.<sup>529</sup> Traditionally, the bow fibulae with a twisted (and also pseudo twisted) bow from the sites in northern Dalmatia were dated into the 9<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>530</sup> According to recent research they should be regarded as typical forms of the Late Bronze and the beginning of the Early Iron Age on the Eastern Adriatic coast and although only several are known, they should be considered being older – dated to the 10<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>531</sup> However, already B. Čović observed differences between the twisted and pseudo twisted bow and regarded it as a possible chronological difference. He did not exclude the possibility of an early appearance of the fibulae with a twisted bow on the territory of the eastern Adriatic, by relying on the dating and arguments proposed by H. Müller-Karpe, and allowing for the possibility that fibulae with a pseudo-twisted bow might be slightly younger than the first ones.<sup>532</sup>

Also the bow fibula with a risen bow and a decoration of incised sheaves of parallel lines (cat. 186) discovered in the same grave in Klačenica as the fibula discussed above should be added into the same chronological and cultural framework.<sup>533</sup> A comparison with the Japodian bow fibulae of group B<sup>534</sup> according to R. Drechsler-Bižić is a formal but not a completely satisfactory decision.<sup>535</sup> Also the dating into the 9<sup>th</sup> century cannot be entirely acceptable. With a high bow, a coil, a relatively narrow hammered foot and without any decorations, this fibula corresponds more to the examples from northern Italy and Protogolasecca dated into phase BF,<sup>536</sup> as well as to the find from the necropolis in Tolmin.<sup>537</sup> To conclude, the bow fibulae from Rijeka and Klačenica should be observed in a direct or indirect connection with the Italian territory and chronologically placed at the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup>, if not at the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> century. They should be conceived as really active factors of a certain message (of a female symbol) in the lively processing of the cultural *koiné*, which, at the peak of its

<sup>527</sup> Batović 1968: T. X; Batović 1976: Sl. 14; Hiller 1991: T. 21-22: 228-235; Glogović 2003: T. 10: 60.

<sup>528</sup> Teßmann 2001: 47-48.

<sup>529</sup> Batović 1981: 112, 99, Sl. 4: 2.

<sup>530</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: 429; Batović 1981: 17, 99, Sl. 4; Glogović 1989: 18-19, 41.

<sup>531</sup> Glogović 2003: 17. Since the chronology of the Liburnian group is a parallelism of Italian cultures (for example Batović 1983; Batović 1987a) and due to the finds of imported artifacts which can be exactly dated, the I. phase of the Iron Age should start somewhere in the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century and the II<sup>nd</sup> phase in the 9<sup>th</sup> century as it was already suggested by D. Glogović (1989: 40, Sl. 9). The grave number 24 from Nin should consequently be dated in to the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century; comp. Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014.

<sup>532</sup> Čović 1971a: 76. Since D. Glogović is referring to the work of B. Čović and regarding the dating as well as the characteristics of these fibulae their equalization in almost the same typological category as well as the claim that these are elements of attire typical for the territory of the Liburnians and the Dalmatians cannot be accepted.

<sup>533</sup> Brunšmid 1901: 56-57, T. I: 6.

<sup>534</sup> These fibulae have a smooth bow with incisions organized in metopes but are considerably more massive and bulky. Beside that they have a hammered foot which is often additionally decorated. The origin of these fibulae was sought for in the degenerative (authors remark!) evolution of the fibulae in the form of the violin bow on the north-western Balkan territory (Drechsler-Bižić 1976: 147-148).

<sup>535</sup> Glogović 1989: 18; Glogović 2003: 19.

<sup>536</sup> Eles Masi 1986: 20-21, T. 7, 8; De Marinis 1972: T. XII: 2; De Marinis, Gambari 2005: 200-201, T. 5.

<sup>537</sup> Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 93: 1; Pogačnik 2002: 30, Sl. 7; Teržan 2002: 93.

tolminske nekropole,<sup>539</sup> gdje je uz lučnu fibulu istražena upravo identična tordirana ogrlica, varijante II 1 prema A. Pogačnik.<sup>540</sup> Prema dataciji fibula, B. Teržan i te ogrlice općenito izdvaja kao znakovite elemente nošnje vremena HaB1-B2 horizonta s mogućnošću trajanja do punog 8. stoljeća na prostoru Krasa i Posočja,<sup>541</sup> što bi moglo biti odgovarajuće primjenjivo i na klaćenički nalaz.

Naime, iz dosadašnjeg je izlaganja zato jasno predstavljeno kako se upravo na tom području Krasa, Notranjske pa sve do Posočja, logički, pruža mnoštvo paralela za građu iz prostora kvarnerskog bazena. Tako se na nekropoli Brežec nalaze, pored ostalih, i najbolje analogije dvjema polumjesečastim fibulama koje potječu iz Rijeke ili njezine najbliže okolice (kat. 129-130, sl. 59).<sup>542</sup> One, nažalost, nemaju poznato mjesto nalaza niti ikakve poblize podatke, ali pored nalaza iz Dalja i Duge gore<sup>543</sup> predstavljaju jedine poznate primjerke iz teritorija današnje Hrvatske. Prema oblikovanju sačuvanog luka pripadaju u red jednostavnih, jednopetljustih polumjesečastih fibula tipa I prema A. Pogačnik,<sup>544</sup> odnosno odgovaraju tipu *Caput Adriae* prema B. Teržan, datiranih već od kraja 10. i s trajanjem do 8. stoljeća (sl. 66).<sup>545</sup> U odnosu na ostale tipove jednopetljustih polumjesečastih fibula smatra se da je ova nastala upravo pod egejskim izravnim utjecajem, protogeometrijskog i geometrijskog doba i da se istovremeno nosila na oba područja njihove rasprostranjenosti.<sup>546</sup> Bit će one tako još jedan element povezanosti sjevernog Jadrana i prostora Egeje, tj. istočnomediterranskog prostora, koje se osim na obližnjem prostoru Krasa i Posočja rasprostiru sve do riječkoga zaljeva (sl. 66).

Riječke fibule nisu identične, već između sebe pokazuju određene različitosti kojima se mogu dijeliti u dvije varijante. Budući da su to pojedinačni nalazi njihova je datacija široko i okvirno određena, kao uostalom i trajanje toga tipa na prostoru *Caput Adriae*. Prva polumjesečasta fibula, koja ima u potpunosti trakast luk i blago raskovanu "J" povinutu nogu, odnosno četvrtasto raskovan luk na mjestu početaka opruge (kat. 129, sl. 59), ubrajala bi se u tip I 1 prema A. Pogačnik,<sup>547</sup> koju obilježava neukrašeni i jednakomjerno rašireni luk. Ona se, dakle, može izravno povezati s fibulom iz groba 259 nekropole Brežec<sup>548</sup> ili s fibulom iz Trnovog kod Ilirske Bistrice,<sup>549</sup> koje se, kao i fibula iz groba 459 tolminske nekropole, datiraju u 10. i 9. stoljeće.<sup>550</sup>

Drugi primjerak polumjesečaste fibule iz Rijeke (kat. 130, sl. 59) usporediv je s fibulom iz groba 186 iz nekropole Brežec,<sup>551</sup> s fibulom iz Šmihela pod Kaculjem, grob 34/35,<sup>552</sup> ali i s fibulama iz Tolmina, posebno s onima iz groba 435 ili 441.<sup>553</sup> U tipološkoj klasifikaciji mogu se ubrojiti u tip I 2a fibula prema A. Pogačnik<sup>554</sup> s ukrašenim lukom uz gornji rub, ali i uz istaknutije rebro uz donji

expansion, the HaB1-B2 period, did not circumvent the territory of the northern Adriatic.

Another small fragment of a thin twisted torques with a square cross-section from the necropolis of Klaćenica (cat. 191)<sup>538</sup> may be associated to these fibulae. This thesis has its base in the finds of grave 393 from the necropolis in Tolmin,<sup>539</sup> where beside a bow fibula a similar torc was discovered, which A. Pogačnik determined as belonging to variant II 1.<sup>540</sup> Based on the dating of fibulae, B. Teržan singles out also torcs as typical elements of attire in the HaB1-B2 period, with a possible duration into the 8<sup>th</sup> century on the territory of Kras and Posočje,<sup>541</sup> which might be correspondingly applied also to the find from Klaćenica.

Based on all the aforementioned, it is clear that the territory of Kras, Notranjska or Posočje logically offers a multitude of parallels for finds discovered in the Kvarner Gulf. On the necropolis of Brežec the best analogies are found to the two crescent-shaped fibulae coming from Rijeka or its immediate surroundings (cat. 129-130, fig. 59).<sup>542</sup> Although neither their exact find-spot nor any precise context of discovery are known, they are, besides the finds from Dalj and Duga gora,<sup>543</sup> the only finds of such a type found on the territory of today's Croatia. According to the shaping of the preserved bow, they belong to the group of simple crescent-shaped fibulae with a single loop of type I according to A. Pogačnik,<sup>544</sup> i.e. they correspond to the *Caput Adriae* type according to B. Teržan, dated into the period of the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century and during until the 8<sup>th</sup> century (fig. 66).<sup>545</sup> In relation to all other types of crescent-shaped fibulae with a single loop, this type's development is seen as a direct result of Aegean influence, in the protogeometric and geometric period, and it was worn at the same time on both areas of its distribution.<sup>546</sup> This is yet another element demonstrating the connections of the northern Adriatic with its hinterland stretching from Kras and Posočje to the bay of Rijeka with the territory of the Aegean or the eastern Mediterranean in general (fig. 66).

The fibulae from Rijeka are not identical and can be divided into two variants based on their specific differences. Since they are stray finds, their dating is determined only in a wide range, as well as the duration of this type of fibulae on the territory of *Caput Adriae*. The first crescent-shaped fibula, whose bow is completely band-like shaped and a slightly hammered J shaped folded foot on the spot where the spring starts (cat.

sa iz Krka (kat. 20)?

<sup>539</sup> Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 76: 393.

<sup>540</sup> Pogačnik 2002: 51, Sl. 41.

<sup>541</sup> Teržan 2002: 94.

<sup>542</sup> Glogović 2003: 67, T. 53: 501-502.

<sup>543</sup> Teržan 1990a: 77; Balen-Letunić 1986: T. 4: 6; Glogović 2003: 68.

<sup>544</sup> Pogačnik 2002: 32, Sl. 15.

<sup>545</sup> Teržan 1990a: 50-52, Sl. 2; Teržan 2002: 95, K. 2.

<sup>546</sup> Teržan 2007: 162-163, Pl. XXXVIIa.

<sup>547</sup> Pogačnik 2002: 32, Sl. 15.

<sup>548</sup> Steffè de Piero 1977: T. XXII: T. 259: 4.

<sup>549</sup> Urleb 1974: Sl. 3: 7; Teržan 1990a: 52, T. 3: 7.

<sup>550</sup> Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 88: 1; Teržan 2002: 95.

<sup>551</sup> Steffè de Piero 1977: T. XVIII: T. 186: 3.

<sup>552</sup> Guštin 1975: T. 8: 2.

<sup>553</sup> Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 84: 8; 85: 12.

<sup>554</sup> Pogačnik 2002: Sl. 15.

<sup>538</sup> This fragment was published in the existing literature as a fragment of a twisted bracelet (Brunšmid 1901: 55, T. I: 8; Glogović 1989: 33, T. 35: 8) which cannot be accepted considering its dimensions and manufacture. In the same way due to the massiveness and the way of twisting the wire as well as the hammered ends and the length of the twisting itself, the comparisons with finds from depots from the territory of northern Croatia, which implicated the dating (Glogović 1989: 33) were not satisfactory. Perhaps we can observe some similarities at the small thin necklace from the grave 3/1916 from Velika Gorica (Vinski-Gasparini 1973: T. 104: 21) which was twisted until the rolled up end as well as at the necklaces from Klaćenica and Tolmin. In the same way, there is a similarity observable at a necklace from Dalj in grave 66 from the locality of Pošćić vineyard (Metzner-Nebelsick 2002: 445, T. 83: 11) which is not twisted up to the very end, but is of a gracile workmanship and has a square cross section of thinly hammered wire at the ends. Finally, a very close parallel is a small necklace from the sanctuary of Enodia of the Pherai group (Kilian 1975: T. 65: 4). Due to lack of data about the context of discovery from Klaćenica we can only speculate about a child's or a young girl's grave. Perhaps we could add also a fragment of a twisted torques from Krk (cat. 20)?

<sup>539</sup> Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 76: 393.

<sup>540</sup> Pogačnik 2002: 51, Sl. 41.

<sup>541</sup> Teržan 2002: 94.


<sup>542</sup> Glogović 2003: 67, T. 53: 501-502.

<sup>543</sup> Teržan 1990a: 77; Balen-Letunić 1986: T. 4: 6; Glogović 2003: 68.

<sup>544</sup> Pogačnik 2002: 32, Sl. 15.

<sup>545</sup> Teržan 1990a: 50-52, Sl. 2; Teržan 2002: 95, K. 2.

<sup>546</sup> Teržan 2007: 162-163, Pl. XXXVIIa.



**Slika 66.** Karta rasprostranjenosti jednopetljustih polumjesečastih fibula tipa *Caput Adriae* (●) prema Teržan i tipa II4 prema Blinkenbergu/Ild prema Sapouna Sakallerakis/Ilf2 prema Caner (▲) (nadopunjeno prema Teržan 2007) (Lista 15).

**Figure 66.** Distribution map demonstrating the spread of crescent-shaped fibulae with a single loop of the *Caput Adriae* (●) type according to Teržan and type II4 according to Blinkenberg/Ild according to Sapouna Sakallerakis/Ilf2 according to Caner (▲) (supplemented after Teržan 2007) (List 15).

rub i trapezasto raskovanu nožicu. Sukladno dataciji tolminskog groba 441, gdje se takva fibula nalazila s iglom tipa Marco,<sup>555</sup> i tu fibulu iz Rijeke treba datirati u mogući dulji raspon trajanja od 10. do 8. stoljeća. Za obje je opisane riječke fibule D. Glogović smatrala kako su importirane vjerojatno iz prostora svetolucijske ili notranjske skupine i razlikovala ih kronološki, starijim i mlađim oblikom, predlažući odveć nisku dataciju, od kraja 9. do početka 7. stoljeća.<sup>556</sup> Riječke se fibule prostorno i vremenski posve "prirodno" uklapaju u rasprostiranje polumjesečastih fibula tipa *Caput Adriae*, od rijeke Adige do Save (sl. 66). Kulturološki oslikavaju odraz neprekinute povezanosti riječkog, a time i kvarnerskog podneblja s jugoistočnim alpskim zaleđem te ujedno trajanje i prisutnost u općenitim trendovima regionalne sjevernojadranske ali i prostrane, mediteranske *koiné*.

Polumjesečaste su fibule bile i jesu sasvim pouzdan argument za jedan od oblika kontinuirane komunikacije i kontakata s istočnim Sredozemljem, sve do Cipra, pa čak i u progresivnom zamahu ranoga željeznoga doba (sl. 66). Upravo na tome otoku nalaze se i zapanjujuće sličnosti, odnosno najrealnije paralele posudi tipa skiphos iz Rijeke (kat. 151, sl. 67: 2). Ta posuda obilježava još jedan neobičan predmet materijalne kulture iz zbirke PPMHP u Rijeci, kojoj mjesto nalaženja, niti bilo koji precizniji podatci nisu poznati. Skifos, konično oblikovanog donjeg dijela tijela, postavljen je na maloj prstenastoj stopi/nozi, a par malih blago izdignutih

129, fig. 59), could be included into type I1 according to A. Pogačnik,<sup>547</sup> a type characterized by the undecorated and regularly widened bow. It could be directly connected to the fibula from grave 259 of the Brežec necropolis<sup>548</sup> or the fibula from Trnovo near Ilirska Bistrica,<sup>549</sup> which, as well as the fibula from grave 459 from the necropolis of Tolmin, could be dated into the 10<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>550</sup>

The second example of the crescent-shaped fibula from Rijeka (cat. 130, fig. 59) is comparable to the fibula from grave 186 from the Brežec necropolis,<sup>551</sup> the fibula from Šmihel above Kaculj, grave 34/35,<sup>552</sup> and to the fibulae from Tolmin, graves 435 and 441.<sup>553</sup> According to their typological classification it could be included into type I 2a according to A. Pogačnik.<sup>554</sup> These are fibulae with a bow decorated on the upper edge and with a pronounced rib along the lower edge as well as with a trapezoidal hammered foot. Since the fibula from grave 441 from Tolmin was accompanied with a pin of the Marco type,<sup>555</sup> the fibula from Rijeka could be dated into a broad period ranging from the 10<sup>th</sup> to the 8<sup>th</sup> century. Both fibulae from Rijeka were regarded by D. Glogović as most probably imported from the territory of Sv. Lucija or the Notranjska cul-

<sup>555</sup> Teržan 2002: 96.

<sup>556</sup> Glogović 2003: 67-68.

<sup>547</sup> Pogačnik 2002: 32, Sl. 15.

<sup>548</sup> Steffè de Piero 1977: T. XXII: T. 259: 4.

<sup>549</sup> Urleb 1974: Sl. 3: 7; Teržan 1990a: 52, T. 3: 7.

<sup>550</sup> Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 88: 1; Teržan 2002: 95.

<sup>551</sup> Steffè de Piero 1977: T. XVIII: T. 186: 3.

<sup>552</sup> Guštin 1975: T. 8: 2.

<sup>553</sup> Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001: T. 84: 8; 85: 12.

<sup>554</sup> Pogačnik 2002: Sl. 15.

<sup>555</sup> Teržan 2002: 96.



**Slika 67.** Ciparski skifosi sa središnjem ukrasom Andrijina križa – 1: Stylli, G. 6 (prema SCE 1935), 2: Rijeka? (foto: M. Blečić Kavur), 3: Enkomi, Kaminia grob 1 (prema SCE 1935).

**Figure 67.** Cypriote skyphoi with the central ornament in the form of the St. Andrew's cross – 1: Stylli, G. 6 (after SCE 1935), 2: Rijeka? (Photo: M. Blečić Kavur), 3: Enkomi, Kaminia grave 1 (after SCE 1935).

ručki, nefunkcionalnog karaktera, postavljene su na sredini tijela posude. Na prednjoj i stražnjoj se strani nalazi središnji ukras tzv. Andrijinog križa koji je flankiran snopovima od sedam paralelnih tankih linija. Čitava je posuda oslikana mat, tamnosmeđom bojom na vrlo svijetloj boji podloge.

Navedena obilježja skifosa, i formom i dekorativnim ornamentima, tipična su za tzv. *White Painted* keramičku produkciju II-III tipa željeznodobnog Cipra. Pa iako ta keramika ukazuje na kontinuitet iz prijašnjeg kasnomikenskog razdoblja, kako u oblicima tako i u načinu ukrašavanja, još od *Proto-White Painted*, tj. od 11. stoljeća razvijao se taj lokalni stil ukrašavanja isključivo ciparskih karakteristika.<sup>557</sup> Skifosi se na Cipru javljaju u bogatim grobnicama s mačevima i fibulama sa dva dugmeta na luku, pr. u Lapithosu,<sup>558</sup> ali i s iglama vazasto oblikovane glavice.<sup>559</sup> Uz ostale geometrijske motive najčešće prisutan ukras na tim skifosima predstavlja ornament Andrijina križa kojeg je J. Boardman interpretirao kao usvojen motiv, odnosno kao grčku kopiju u ciparskoj keramografiji. No motiv Andrijinog križa, iako dugo zastupljen na grčkoj keramici, nikad nije zaživio na grčkim skifosima.<sup>560</sup> To je ekskluzivnost ciparske geometrijske keramografske produkcije kako pokazuju nalazi iz Palepaphosa, Enkomi (Kaminia grob 1) ili Stylli (grob 6, 8 ...),<sup>561</sup> koji su ujedno i najbliži primjerci riječkome skifosu (sl. 67: 1, 3). Zbog navedenog postoje i suprotna mišljenja koja su suglasna da je motiv Andrijina križa zapravo utjecaj ciparskog geometrijskog stila na kasno geometrijsku keramičku produkciju istočne Grčke (sl. 67).<sup>562</sup>

Kronološki, ta se keramika podudara s podjelom ciparskih kulturnih stupnjeva, pa ulazi u ciparski geometrijski stil 2. i 3. faze koje se

tural group. She distinguished them chronologically into an older and a younger form, but suggested a too young dating for them: from the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> until the beginning of the 7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>556</sup> In terms of territory and chronology the Rijeka fibulae do absolutely "naturally" fit into the distribution of crescent-shaped fibulae of the *Caput Adriae* type – from the Adige to the Sava River (fig. 66). Culturally they reflect the uninterrupted connection of the territory of Rijeka, and thereby also of the Kvarner region, with the south-eastern Alpine hinterland, demonstrating at the same time the duration and the presence in the general trends of the regional north Adriatic, but also of the vast Mediterranean *koiné*.

In the progressive impetus of the Early Iron Age, crescent-shaped fibulae were and are a firm argument for one of the forms of continuous communication and contacts with the eastern Mediterranean stretching all the way to Cyprus (fig. 66). It is especially on this island that fascinating similarities and most suitable comparisons to the skyphos from Rijeka can be observed (cat. 151, fig. 6: 2). This vessel is another uncommon artifact in the collection of the PPMHP in Rijeka, which unfortunately has no data concerning its find-spot or any other information.

A skyphos with a conically shaped lower body is placed on a short ring-shaped foot, and a pair of small, slightly elevated non-functional, handles are placed in the middle of the vessel's lower body. On the front and back sides there is a central decoration in the shape of the so called Saint Andrew's cross with sheaf of seven thin parallel lines on the sides. The whole pot is painted in a mat, dark brown color on a very light grounding.

The listed characteristics of the skyphos, formal and decorative, are typical of the so called *White Painted* pottery production of the II-III type of the Iron Age Cyprus. Although this pottery indicates a continuity from the previous Late Mycenaean period, both in terms of its forms and styles of decorations, it was already since the *Proto-White Painted* or the 11<sup>th</sup> century that a local style of uniquely Cypriote decorations developed.<sup>557</sup> The skyphoi were often found in Cyprus in graves with swords and fibulae

<sup>557</sup> Catling 1975: 38-42, 44, Fig. IIIa; Karageorghis 2002: 117-149.

<sup>558</sup> SCE 1934: T. 401, 402, 417.

<sup>559</sup> SCE 1934: T. 403.

<sup>560</sup> Demetriou 1989: 20-21.

<sup>561</sup> Karageorghis 2002: Sl. 83; SCE 1935: Pl. XXXI, XXXII, XCIV: s.615.

<sup>562</sup> Demetriou 1989: 21.

<sup>556</sup> Glogović 2003: 67-68.

<sup>557</sup> Catling 1975: 38-42, 44, Fig. IIIa; Karageorghis 2002: 117-149.



apsolutno smještaju od sredine 10. pa sve do sredine 8. stoljeća.<sup>563</sup> U tom bi vremenskom okviru i keramičkoj produkciji mogli, dakle, poimati i riječki skifos koji se, vjerojatno, može povezati s devastiranom prapovijesnom nekropolom u Rijeci, kao što je to učinjeno i/ili prihvaćeno i za sve ostale predmete materijalne kulture koji nemaju tako "neobično" ili "egzotično" podrijetlo. Iz prizme sagledavanja kulturnih povezivanja prostora sjevernoga Jadrana i nedjeljivo pripadajućeg jugoistočnog alpskog prostora, s Ciprom svakako treba računati i s postojećim, vremenski nešto starijim paralelama, kao što su jantarne perle tipa Tiryns i Allumiere (sl. 25), lučne fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku (sl. 18), već više puta istaknuti željezni noževi iz Škocjana i Tolmina, kladivo iz Hudinje, ulomak ingota iz Hočkog Pohorja ili Propetta kod Udina (sl. 88),<sup>564</sup> te napokon ulomak brončanog tronošca iz ostave Udje (sl. 88).<sup>565</sup> Svi su ti predmeti dio složeno nijansiranog spektra kulturnih kontakata s istočnim Sredozemljem na prijelomu tisućljeća, u kojima vjerojatno treba razumijevati i riječki skifos.

Ukoliko pak skifos nije nađen u Rijeci, nego je posljedica kolekcionarstva ili poklona iz egzotičnih krajeva (?!),<sup>566</sup> ova je kratka diskusija predstavljena i s još jednom svrhom. Naime, opisana je posuda u arheološkoj literaturi dugo vremena bila zapravo interpretirana, iako nikada publicirana, kao posuda apulske, daunijske keramografske proizvodnje. Zbog toga je Rijeka kartirana gotovo na svim kartama rasprostiranja daunijske keramike na istočnim obalama sjevernoga Jadrana, što bi ovime konačno trebalo biti ispravljeno. U Rijeci do sada nije zabilježena keramika daunijske provenijencije.

## O zmijastim fibulama i "Jadranskoj" koiné

Opisane male lučne fibule, različitih varijanti, u svakom primjeru potenciraju kulturne kontakte sa srednjomediteranskim krugom koji će otada postati sve jačeg intenziteta. Zato su, ako je suditi prema nalazima s italskih nalazišta, male lučne fibule označavale dakle repertoar ženske nošnje, dok su fibule sa spiralnim lukom i dvodijelne zmijaste fibule obilježavale mušku nošnju.<sup>567</sup> Grobovi nekropole Terni, već s razlogom navedeni 1, 116, 130 itd., zanimljivi su zbog kombinacije različitih tipova lučnih fibula i njihovih varijanti. Kao i u Laciju, tako i u Kampaniji (npr. Sala Consilina, Pontecagnano) dokumentirana je pojava lučnih fibula sa spiralno namotanom lukom i spiralnim diskom na nozi koje zapravo obilježavaju tzv. *srednjo-tirenski facies* kraja BF3 i početnoga PF1, odnosno datirane su od druge polovine 10. s trajanjem do u prvu polovinu 9. stoljeća.<sup>568</sup>

Komparativno, upravo na fibulama iz Terni razmatrana je i jedina takva fibula koja ne potječe iz Grizana,<sup>569</sup> kako se to konvencionalno i pogreš-

with two knobs on the bow as for example in Lapithos,<sup>558</sup> but also with pins with a vase-shaped head.<sup>559</sup> Alongwith other geometric motives, the decoration in the form of Saint Andrew's cross, present of these skyphoi, was interpreted by J. Boardman as an adopted motive – a Greek copy on the Cypriot ware. However, the motive of Saint Andrew's cross, although present for a long time on Greek pottery, never appeared on the skyphoi.<sup>560</sup> This is exclusively a characteristic of the Cypriot geometric production as demonstrated by the finds from Palepaphos, Enkomi (Kaminia grave 1) or Stylli (graves 6, 8 ...)<sup>561</sup> which are the closest parallels to the skyphos from Rijeka (fig. 67: 1, 3). Of course, there are also contrary opinions claiming that the motive of Saint Andrew's cross is an influence of the Cypriot geometric style on the late geometric production of eastern Greece (fig. 67).<sup>562</sup>

Chronologically, this pottery corresponds to the division of Cypriot cultural phases and it belongs to the Cypriot geometric style of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> phase, which is absolutely dated from the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> until the middle of the 8<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>563</sup> This is the chronological framework in which the skyphos from Rijeka could be observed, which should be connected to the devastated prehistoric necropolis as it was done for all the other artifacts without a known provenience and without an "unusual" and "exotic" origin. From the perspective of observation of cultural connections of the northern Adriatic territory and the inseparable south-eastern Alpine area with Cyprus, we should not forget the existing, although slightly older, parallels as the amber beads of the Tiryns and Allumiere type (fig. 25), the bow fibulae with two knobs on the bow (fig. 18), several times exposed iron knives from Škocjan and Tolmin, the hammer from Hudinja, a fragment of an ingot from Hočko Pohorje or from Propetto near Udine (fig. 88),<sup>564</sup> and finally a fragment of a bronze tripod from the depot from Udje (fig. 88).<sup>565</sup> All these artifacts are a part of a complexly leveled spectrum of cultural contacts with the eastern Mediterranean at the turn of the Millennium, within which also the skyphos from Rijeka should be observed.

In the event that the skyphos was not discovered in Rijeka, but it was rather the consequence of a collection, or a gift from exotic places (?),<sup>566</sup> this short discussion has been presented with one more purpose. In fact, for a long time the given vessel was interpreted in the archaeological literature, although never published, as an example of the Apulian Daunian ceramic production. Consequently, almost on all maps showing the distribution of the Daunian ware, Rijeka was positioned on the eastern coast of the northern Adriatic, which should be corrected at this point. No single piece of Daunian pottery production has been discovered in Rijeka so far.

## On serpentine fibulae and the "Adriatic" koiné

The described small sized bow fibulae of different variants marked the repertoire of female attire, whereas fibulae with a spiral bow and two-part serpentine fibulae, if judging according to the finds from

<sup>563</sup> Catling 1975: 38; Demetriou 1989: 17-21, Pl.76; Karageorghis 2002: 143-149.

<sup>564</sup> Borgna 2009: 296-298, Fig. 3: 2.

<sup>565</sup> Teržan 1996: 247-250; Blečić Kavur 2012a: 105-16, Sl. 4.

<sup>566</sup> Principijelno je zbog nedostatka podrobnijih podataka potrebno biti na oprezu i iznijeti obje opcije. Ipak, ta se mogućnost čini manje vjerojatnom, jer bi i u slučaju njezina poklona PPMHP bilo barem još po nekoliko »egzotičnih« predmeta, ili predmeta povezanih s tom posudom, koji zasigurno ne bi bili inventirani jednako kao i sva ostala građa koja obilježava mjesnu prošlost prapovijesnog doba, kao što je inventiran i sam skifos. Poklonjena građa inventirala se uostalom na zaseban način i s obveznom opaskom, što je sve zapisano u staroj inventarnoj knjizi *Museo Civico* iz Rijeke.

<sup>567</sup> Salzani 2001: 101.

<sup>568</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 43; 44; Peroni et al. 1980: T. XLIII-XLV; Pacciarelli 2001: 54, 60, Fig. 29, 32, 33; Naso 2003: 214; Leonelli 2003: 282-286, Fig. 68.

<sup>569</sup> Batović 1981: 94, Sl. 2: 4; Batović 1983: 310, T. XLV: 4; Glogović 2003: 22, T. 13: 116.

<sup>558</sup> SCE 1934: T. 401, 402, 417.

<sup>559</sup> SCE 1934: T. 403.

<sup>560</sup> Demetriou 1989: 20-21.

<sup>561</sup> Karageorghis 2002: Sl. 83; SCE 1935: Pl. XXXI, XXXII, XCIV: s.615.


<sup>562</sup> Demetriou 1989: 21.

<sup>563</sup> Catling 1975: 38; Demetriou 1989: 17-21, Pl. 76; Karageorghis 2002: 143-149.

<sup>564</sup> Borgna 2009: 296-298, Fig. 3: 2.

<sup>565</sup> Teržan 1996: 247-250; Blečić Kavur 2012a: 105-16, Sl. 4.

<sup>566</sup> As a rule, due to lack of information we have to be cautious and formulate both possibilities. Still, this seems less likely since in case of a gift we could assume the presence of at least several "exotic" artifacts in the collection of the PPMHP. Or we could expect the presence of several artifacts linked to this vessel which would not be listed in the inventory in a way similar to all other archaeological finds from the museum. In the old inventory list of the *Museo Civico* from Rijeka the gifts were listed in a separate way with a mandatory.



**Slika 68.** Jednodijelne i dvodijelne zmijaste fibule s prostora Kvarnera u različitim varijantama (1-4, 8: prema Glogović 2003)

**Figure 68.** Different variants of single- and two-part serpentine fibulae from the territory of Kvarner (1-4, 8: after Glogović 2003).

no navodilo u literaturi, već iz Garice (kat. 161)! Istražio ju je i napokon objavio sam Š. Ljubić.<sup>570</sup> Iako *unicum*, bila je opredijeljena u tipične oblike kasnog brončanog doba na istočnoj obali Jadrana,<sup>571</sup> i prema navedenim je analogijama datirana u 10. i 9. stoljeće, kao uostalom i sve lučne prije navedene fibule iz prostora Kvarnera.<sup>572</sup> U transjadranskoj relaciji toga vremena interpretiran je i još jedan, nedavno izdvojen, ulomak luka od četiri spiralno uvijene brončane žice iz ostave Veliki Mošunj.<sup>573</sup> Naizgled doista predstavlja gotovo identičnu paralelu garičkome primjerku, a uz ostale, to je jedan od ključnih argumenata P. Königa za višu dataciju ostave, tj. u 9. stoljeće.<sup>574</sup> Međutim, ovdje treba napomenuti kako to nije isključivo autorova ideja, već je naime i B. Čović jasno istaknuo postojanje tog ulomka identificirajući ga kao fibulu, ali nažalost uz neadekvatne paralele.<sup>575</sup> Kako bilo da bilo, ulomku fibule nedostaju ključni dijelovi za precizniju tipološku klasifikaciju. Spiralno namotana brončana žica krasila je i lukove japodskih fibula, kako lučnih tako i dvodijelnih fibula tipa Prozor koje se upravo i datiraju široko u stupanj HaB.<sup>576</sup>

No, osim na području srednje Italije i u njezinom je sjevernom, nama izrazito važnom dijelu padske nizine zabilježeno nekoliko

the Italian sites, marked the male one.<sup>567</sup> Consequently, graves 1, 116, 130 and others from the necropolis of Terni are interesting since they included different combinations of bow fibulae of different types and their variants. As in Latium, so in Campania (for example Sala Consilina, Pontecagnano), the appearance of bow fibulae with a spirally coiled up bow and a spiral disc was documented. They marked the so called Middle-Tyrrhenian facies of the final BF3 and the initial PF1 and were dated into the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>568</sup>

Comparatively, it was exactly on the Terni fibulae that the only such fibula was observed that does not come from Grižane,<sup>569</sup> as wrongly stated in the literature, but from Garica (cat. 161)! It was excavated and published by Š. Ljubić himself.<sup>570</sup> Although being a *unicum*, it was listed among the typical finds of the Late Bronze Age on the eastern Adriatic coast,<sup>571</sup> and according to the mentioned analogies dated into the 10<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> century, as all other aforementioned bow fibulae from the Kvarner territory.<sup>572</sup> In the trans-Adriatic relation of that period, another recently identified fragment of a bow was interpreted made of four coiled up bronze wire from the hoard of Veliki Mošunj.<sup>573</sup> At first glance they appear identical to the example from Garica, and this is, among other things, one of the key arguments for the author to date the hoard higher into the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>574</sup>

<sup>570</sup> Ljubić 1876: 41, T. IV: 5. Autor je i podrobno katalogizira: 14. Našasta na Garici kod Vrbnika od S. Ljubica. Nije podpuna, jer manjka igla. Sastavljena od 4 trostruka zavojka na obluk od iste žice i od noska na plosnasti okrug, gdje je igla padala... (Ljubić 1876: 41).

<sup>571</sup> Batović 1981: 94, Sl. 2. Zajedno sa zmijastom fibulom i s lučnom fibulom sa dva dugmeta na luku te narukvicama dvoslovnog presjeka tretirana je u gotovo svim radovima Š. Batovića kao zatvorena grobna cjelina. Vidjeti o tome dalje u tekstu.

<sup>572</sup> Glogović 2003: 17, 23.

<sup>573</sup> König 2004a: 132, T. I: 5.

<sup>574</sup> Autor se s pravom čudi što je u posljednjoj obradi fibula iz Grižana objavljena kao sporadičan nalaz, ako su razni autori smatrali da je riječ o dijelovima grobnog inventara (König 2004a: 132). Ujedno, zbog neadekvatnog definiranja zemljopisnog područja kod D. Glogović (2003), Grižane su obrađivane u sklopu sjeverne Dalmacije, što nikako ne odgovara istini i dovodi do nemale zabune! Zabuna je tim veća što se sada zna da ta fibula nije bila dio inventara grižanskog, već garičkog nalaza!

<sup>575</sup> Čović 1983: 442.

<sup>576</sup> Teßmann 2001: 65-69.

<sup>567</sup> Salzani 2001: 101.

<sup>568</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 43; 44; Peroni et al. 1980: T. XLIII-XLV; Pacciarelli 2001: 54, 60, Fig. 29, 32, 33; Naso 2003: 214; Leonelli 2003: 282-286, Fig. 68.

<sup>569</sup> Batović 1981: 94, Sl. 2: 4; Batović 1983: 310, T. XLV: 4; Glogović 2003: 22, T. 13: 116.

<sup>570</sup> Ljubić 1876: 41, T. IV: 5. The author describes it in detail: "14. Discovered in Garica near Vrbnik by Š. Ljubić. It is not complete since the pin is missing. It is composed from 4 triple coils from the same wire and a holder in the form of a flat circle where the pin was resting..." (Ljubić 1876: 41).


<sup>571</sup> Batović 1981: 94, Sl. 2. Together with a serpentine fibula and a bowed fibula with two knobs on the bow and the bracelets with a double-pitch cross-section it was treated in almost all works of Š. Batović as an *intact* grave inventory. See the discussion further in the text.

<sup>572</sup> Glogović 2003: 17, 23.

<sup>573</sup> König 2004a: 132, T. I: 5.

<sup>574</sup> The author is rightfully surprised by the fact that in the last processing, the





**Slika 69.** Karta rasprostranjenosti zmijastih jednodijelnih tropetljastih fibula (▲), dvodijelnih (●) i zmijastih dvodijelnih fibula s rebrima (■) (nadopunjeno prema Blečić Kavur 2012b).

**Figure 69.** Distribution map of the one-part serpentine fibulae with three loops (▲), two-part serpentine fibulae (●) and the two-part serpentine fibula with ribs (■) (supplemented after Blečić Kavur 2012b).

fibula toga tipa.<sup>577</sup> Tako je jedna fibula istražena u grobu 41a nekropole Colombare, zajedno s ulomkom dvodijelne zmijaste fibule s rebrima,<sup>578</sup> dok je po još jedan primjerak poznat iz frattesinskog groba 7 nekropole Fondo Zanotto<sup>579</sup> i groba 39 nekropole Narde.<sup>580</sup> Ondje su datirane u kasno protovillanovsko vrijeme (BF) i obrazlagane snažnim vezama sa srednjo-tirenskim kulturnim krugom, osobito u relaciji *koiné metallurgica Frattesi-na – Etruria mineraria* još od 11. stoljeća,<sup>581</sup> a u toj je istoj relaciji objašnjavan i sporadični nalaz takve fibule iz ascolanskog područja u Picenumu.<sup>582</sup> No i u Frattisini, Fondo Zanotto grobovi 27 i 31, nađena je zmijasta dvodijelna fibula s rebrima ili prstenastim ukrasima,<sup>583</sup> kao i u Colombari, Fontanelli, baš kao i u Morano sul Po<sup>584</sup> itd. Tako su te fibule na neki način postale, i postaju, sve značajniji element šireg prostora i sjevernije padske nizine (sl. 69).

Zmijaste su pak fibule po zastupljenosti drugi oblik fibula poznat s prostora Kvarnera, s ukupno 8 komada. Razlikuju se doduše u dva osnovna tipa, jednodijelne i dvodijelne, i u čak četiri inačice. U osnovi je riječ o varijantama jednodijelne fibule koje su rijedak

However, here it should be noted that this was not exclusively the idea of P. König, since B. Čović already recognized the fragments as parts of a fibula, but unfortunately listed inadequate analogies.<sup>575</sup> In any case, the diagnostic pieces for a detailed typological determination are missing. Spirally coiled up wire decorated also the bows of Japodian fibulae – of the bow fibulae as well as the two-part fibulae of the Prozor type, which could also be dated into a broader range covering the HaB period.<sup>576</sup>

However, with the exception of central Italy, several fibulae of this type were documented in northern Italy, in the part of the Po Plain so important to us.<sup>577</sup> Hence, a fibula was discovered in grave 41a of the necropolis Colombara together with a fragment of a two-part serpentine fibula with ribs,<sup>578</sup> while another example is known from grave 7 at the Frattesi-na necropolis Fondo Zanotto<sup>579</sup> and grave 39 of the necropolis Narde.<sup>580</sup> There they were dated into the late Protovillanovan period (BF) and explained as strong connections to

fibula from Grižane was published as a sporadic find, although various authors considered it to be part of a grave inventory (König 2004a: 132). At the same time, due to the inadequate definition of the geographic territory by D. Glogović (2003), Grižane were discussed within the framework of northern Dalmatia, which does not reflect reality and is misleading! The error is even greater now that we know this fibula was not part of the find from Grižane, but from *Garica!*

<sup>577</sup> Eles Masi 1986: 210, T. 162: 2130.

<sup>578</sup> Salzani 2001: 87, Fig. 6: B3.

<sup>579</sup> De Min 1984: T. IX: 6.

<sup>580</sup> Salzani 1991: Fig. 23: 7.

<sup>581</sup> De Min 1984: 479-480; Bianchin Citton 1987: 40-42. Usp. Bietti Sestieri 2008.

<sup>582</sup> Lucentini 2007: 104, Fig. 5: 4.

<sup>583</sup> De Min 1984: T. VI: 2.

<sup>584</sup> Salzani 2001: 87, Fig. 6: B3; Salzani 1978: 1: 11, 18, 4: 4-6, 17: 3, 7; Giaretti, Rubat Borel 2006: 103, Fig. 102: 4.

<sup>575</sup> Čović 1983: 442.


<sup>576</sup> Teßmann 2001: 65-69.

<sup>577</sup> Eles Masi 1986: 210, T. 162: 2130.

<sup>578</sup> Salzani 2001: 87, Fig. 6: B3.

<sup>579</sup> De Min 1984: T. IX: 6.

<sup>580</sup> Salzani 1991: Fig. 23: 7.



**Slika 70.** Pojedinačni nalazi iz uništenih grobova kod Dabo stanova u Novalji (prema Batović 1973; Glogović 2003).

**Figure 70.** Individual finds from destroyed graves in Dabo stanovi near Novalja (after Batović 1973; Glogović 2003).

tip, i svojim primjerima predstavljaju i dalje jedinstvene nalaze na teritoriju istočnojadranskog priobalja i zaleđa. Drugi tip, odnosno dvodijelne zmijaste fibule znatno su učestaliji nalaz raspoređen duž brojnih nalazišta italskog i istočnojadranskog kopna.

S istočnog dijela pružanja kvarnerskog bazena, s nalazišta Gradac-Turan kod Koromačnog, potječe jednodijelna zmijasta fibula sa tri petlje, sedlastog luka i vjerojatno s diskom na kraju noge.<sup>585</sup> Riječ je o tipu fibule koji nije zastupljen s izrazitom kvantitetom, premda se razlikuje u više varijanti, posebno na prostoru srednje i južne Italije (sl. 68: 1; 69).<sup>586</sup> Upravo stoga, kod fibula iz Allumiere i Pianella možemo vidjeti dobre usporedbe za predmetnu nam fibulu, uklapajući ju time u varijantu s diskom na kraju nožice.<sup>587</sup> Njoj valja, u smislu formalnog tipološkog standarda, pridružiti i fibulu iz zapadnobalkanskog zaleđa, tj. iz Srijeteža kod Kaknja.<sup>588</sup> Riječ je o varijanti istog tipa fibule za koju je još i B. Čović jasno izrekao kako se njezin uzor mora vidjeti na prostoru Italije u konačnim fazama kasnog brončanog doba, ali je shvatiti kao domaći uradak.<sup>589</sup> Ne bi stoga bilo pogrešno samo fibulu iz Gradac-Turana interpretirati kao izravni import iz završnih faza BR3 kultura srednjotirenskog prostora 10. stoljeća, bez pretenzija o njezinom višem značenju u evoluciji mjesnog oblikovanja dvodijelnih zmijastih ili zapadnobalkanskih oblika fibula.<sup>590</sup>

Druga jednodijelna fibula potječe iz paške Novalje, iz Vidasa (kat 40, sl. 23; 68: 2). Fibula ima izvijeni luk s dvije petlje, koja je u stručnu literaturu uvedena prilično neodređeno, uspoređena dvojako; s fibulama luka u obliku violinskog gudala i s dvodijelnim zmijastim fibulama s listasto raskovanim lukom.<sup>591</sup> U novijim pregledima i analizama fibula s lukom u obliku violinskog gudala, fibula iz Novalje nije priložena

the Middle-Tyrrhenian cultural circle, especially in connection of the *koiné metallurgica* Frattesina – *Etruria mineraria* from the 11<sup>th</sup> century onwards.<sup>581</sup> In the same relation an isolated find from the Ascoli area in Picenum was explained.<sup>582</sup> However, in Frattesina, Fondo Zanotto graves 27 and 31, a two-part serpentine fibula with ribs or a ring-like ornament was discovered.<sup>583</sup> The same type was discovered also in Colombara, Fontanella, in Morano sul Po<sup>584</sup> etc. Consequently, fibulae were and are becoming an important element of the broader area of the Po Plain (fig. 69).

Serpentine fibulae are the second most numerous group of fibulae known on the Kvarner territory. Known examples could be divided into two basic types, i.e. one- or two-partite, which could be further divided even into four variants. Basically, the variants of one-part fibulae are dealt with, which are a rare find and represent unique discoveries on the territory of the eastern Adriatic and its hinterland. The second type, i.e. the two-part serpentine fibulae are much more numerous in many sites on the italic and eastern Adriatic mainland.

The one-part fibula with three loops, a saddle formed bow, and most probably with a disc at the end of the foot, comes from the western part of the Kvarner Gulf, from the site Gradac-Turan near Koromačno.<sup>585</sup> It is an example of a relatively rare form of fibulae, although it can be distinguished into several variants, especially on the territory of central and southern Italy (fig. 68: 1; 69).<sup>586</sup> Accordingly, we can observe good parallels in the fibulae from Allumiere and Pianello, whereby the given fibula can be included into the variant with a disc at the end of the foot.<sup>587</sup> With respect to its typological standard, also a fibula from the western Balkan hinterland from Srijetež near Kakanj should be included into the same group.<sup>588</sup> It is a variant of the same type of fibulae

<sup>585</sup> Mihovilić 1997: 45-46, 48, Sl. 17, T. 10: 1; Glogović 2003: 47, T. 47: 354; Teržan 2009: 219, Sl. 3: 3.

<sup>586</sup> Mihovilić 1997: 46; Peroni et al. 1980: 37, T. XVI: 44B, T. XL: 25; Lo Schiavo 2010: 609-610, T. 370: 5295-5296B; Montanaro 2010: 4, Fig. 3.

<sup>587</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 26: 1; T. 56: 36; usp. Peroni et al. 1980: 37; Mihovilić 1997: 46; usp. Nijboer, Plicht 2008: 105-108.

<sup>588</sup> Gavranović 2011/I: 184, Abb. 173: 1-2; II: 55-56, Abb. 63. Pa iako su joj elementi gotovo u potpunosti očuvani, čime ju karakteriziraju kao varijantu zmijastih jednodijelnih tropetljastih fibula s raskucanom nogom, M. Gavranović ju je pripisao dvopetljastim fibulama, poput one iz Soukbunara.

<sup>589</sup> Naime, B. Čović ju tipološki i klasificira k tropetljastim zmijastim fibulama sa sedlastim lukom navodeći joj i najbolje italske paralele i prikazujući je u rekonstruiranom crtežu (Čović 1983: 442, Sl. 31: 5).

<sup>590</sup> Blečić Kavur 2012b: 220, Sl. 9: 1; Sl. 10.

<sup>591</sup> Glogović 1991: 20, T. 3: 5; Glogović 2003: 7-8, T. 1: 6.

<sup>581</sup> De Min 1984: 479-480; Bianchin Citton 1987: 40-42. Comp. Bietti Sestieri 2008.

<sup>582</sup> Lucentini 2007: 104, Fig. 5: 4.

<sup>583</sup> De Min 1984: T. VI: 2.


<sup>584</sup> Salzani 2001: 87, Fig. 6: B3; Salzani 1978: 1: 11, 18, 4: 4-6, 17: 3, 7; Giaretti, Rubat Borel 2006: 103, Fig. 102: 4.

<sup>585</sup> Mihovilić 1997: 45-46, 48, Sl. 17, T. 10: 1; Glogović 2003: 47, T. 47: 354; Teržan 2009: 219, Sl. 3: 3.

<sup>586</sup> Mihovilić 1997: 46; Peroni et al. 1980: 37, T. XVI: 44B, T. XL: 25; Lo Schiavo 2010: 609-610, T. 370: 5295-5296B; Montanaro 2010: 4, Fig. 3.

<sup>587</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 26: 1; T. 56: 36; comp. Peroni et al. 1980: 37; Mihovilić 1997: 46; comp. Nijboer, Plicht 2008: 105-108.

<sup>588</sup> Gavranović 2011/I: 184, Abb. 173: 1-2; II: 55-56, Abb. 63. Although the elements are almost completely preserved enabling the identification of it as a variant of one-part serpentine fibulae with three loops and a hammered foot,



**Slika 71.** Tipološki prikaz zmijastih fibula s obzirom na različitost igala i u odnosu na zamjlopisni položaj; varijante I (●) – Kvarner i varijante II (■) – Liburnija.

**Figure 71.** Typological table of the two-part serpentine fibulae according to the division of the pins and according to the geographical position: variant I (●) – Kvarner and variant II (■) – Liburnia.

niti u grupu sa dvije petlje na luku,<sup>592</sup> što nije učinjeno niti za grupu jednodijelnih zmijastih dvopetljastih fibula tzv. italskog tipa.<sup>593</sup>

Usprkos tomu, novaljska se fibula može konkretno klasificirati upravo u tip jednodijelnih zmijastih fibula sa dvije petlje i ravnom iglom. Tomu svjedoče njezine morfološke odlike, tj. velike dvije petlje na luku četvrtastog presjeka, izdužena ravna igla te listasto i rombično raskovan luk sa središnjim rebrom koji je izvijen i povišen prema petlji noge fibule (kat. 40). Takve su fibule obilježile u znakovitoj mjeri prostor južne Italije, a F. Lo Schiavo ih pribraja svome tipu 306 istoimenih fibula.<sup>594</sup> U većini, fibule imaju istu oblikovnu shemu, te rombično raskovan luk neukrašen ili ukrašen iskucavanjem jednostavnih linearnih motiva točkica ili crtica, poput onih iz Sala Consiline ili Incoronate.<sup>595</sup> Budući da novaljske fibule nije opstala, nije isključeno da se na njezinom završetku nalazio također spiralno namotan disk, toliko omiljen

about which B. Čović clearly stated that its role should be sought for in the final phases of the Late Bronze Age on the territory of Italy, but the fibula itself should be a local product.<sup>589</sup> Within this framework, it would not be a mistake to interpret the fibula from Gradac-Turan as a direct import from the final phases of BR3 from the Middle-Tyrrhenian area in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, but without any pretensions concerning its importance in the evolution of local two-part serpentine or western-Balkan forms of fibulae.<sup>590</sup>

Another one-part fibula comes from Novalja on the island of Pag, more precisely from Vidasi (cat. 40, fig. 23; 68: 2) and has a bow with two loops. This type of fibula has been introduced into the literature in a rather undefined way: it was compared on one side to fibulae in the form of a violin bow, and on the other, to serpentine fibulae with

<sup>592</sup> Kašuba 2008: 208-217, Abb. 15.

<sup>593</sup> Dörner 2008: 570, f.n. 166.

<sup>594</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 375: 5356-5360; T. 376: 5361-5369; T. 745.

<sup>595</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 375: 5356; T. 376: 5362.

M. Gavranović attributed it to the fibulae with two loops, as for example the one from Soukbunar.

<sup>589</sup> B. Čović published an illustration of its reconstruction, classified it as a serpentine fibula with three loops with a saddle shaped bow and listed the best comparisons from the Italian territory (Čović 1983: 442, Sl. 31: 5).


<sup>590</sup> Blečić Kavur 2012b: 220, Sl. 9: 1; Sl. 10.

kod fibula istočnojadranskih kultura, a po čemu bi ju iznova mogli usporediti s fibulama iz Inconornate i s tipom 309.<sup>596</sup> Ipak, izvjesno je da sve navedene fibule nemaju središnjeg rebra na listastom luku, koje se pak susreće kod npr. jednodijelnih tropetljastih fibula iz Salapie i Capue,<sup>597</sup> uglavnom kod različitih tipova zmijastih fibula južnoitalskog prostora. Datacijski su određene vremenu 10. i 9. stoljeća i fazi PF1<sup>598</sup> što bi okvirno moglo biti vrijedeće i za našu fibulu, kako ju je uostalom vremenski i odredila D. Glogović.<sup>599</sup>

Prije izdvojeni italski konteksti ukazuju kako je tada otpočela sve učestalija pojava i dvodijelnih zmijastih fibula s rebrima ili bez njih koje, kako je već rečeno, obilježavaju tzv. *srednjo-tirenski facies* posljednje protovillanovske i početne villanovske faze te velikih ostava toga vremena (BF3/PF1).<sup>600</sup> U trenutačnoj dinamičnoj diskusiji talijanskih kolega dvodijelne zmijaste fibule s rebrima predstavljaju pak jedan od temeljnih oslonaca u rješavanju problema prijelaza relativne kronologije iz brončanog u željezno doba kultura sjeverne Italije (Golasecca I, Este I) u njihovu kompariranju s početkom villanovske kulture središnjeg italskog prostora. U apsolutno-kronološkom aspektu, a na području sjevernijem od rijeke Po, oblik su nošnje dugoga trajanja, znatno dužeg nego na području Bologne, zbog čega su i datirane od druge polovine 10. do prve polovine 9. stoljeća. Time je izgledno kako su neke velike nekropole sjevernoitalskog prostora u svojim posljednjim fazama života nesumnjivo morale biti paralelne s I. fazom Bologne.<sup>601</sup>

Istim vremenskim i kulturološkim aspektom valja promatrati i primjerke dvodijelnih zmijastih fibula s rebrima s istočne obale Jadrana koje potječu iz Osora (kat. 57-58, sl. 68: 3-4).<sup>602</sup> Budući da su ulomci fibula uglavnom tretirani kao izravni italski importi, najzravnije paralele možemo im, s obzirom na snažno istaknuta i profilirana rebra te okruglu glavicu igle, vidjeti kod fibula iz Angarana, Fontanelle ili iz frattesinske Narde.<sup>603</sup> U mogućem produkcijskom smislu i u kronološkoj istovjetnosti, a s obzirom na novije nalaze s područja padske nizine, fibule iz Osora možemo razumijevati kao posljednicu kontakta s tim područjem u tijeku i za kraja protovillanovskog pa do početka villanovskog razdoblja. On je, pribrojimo li i ostale istovremene nalaze materijalne kulture, morao biti ne samo paralelan vremenski nego i suvremen, odnosno ravnopravan italskim kulturama barem u komunikacijskom i ideološkom sustavu interaktivne uzajamnosti (sl. 69).

Zmijastim se dvodijelnim fibulama iz Kvarnera uistinu ambiciozno i analitično, u odnosu na do tada poznata stajališta i hipoteze, posvetila D. Glogović.<sup>604</sup> Ukratko, prihvaćajući najvećim dijelom stavove prijašnjih istraživača autorica je fibule, definirane kao "jadranski tip" koji se razvio iz italskih tipova,<sup>605</sup> razradila i razmatrala unutar optjecanja procesa jadranske kulturne *koiné*, odnosno kao odraz snažnih kontakata istočne i zapadne obale Jadrana značajnih za kraj brončanog i početak željeznog doba Liburnije 10. stoljeća.<sup>606</sup> Time



**Slika 72.** Karta rasprostranjenosti zmijastih dvodijelnih fibula s obzirom na tipologiju igala kao na slici 71; varijanta I (●) i varijanta II (■) (Lista 16).

**Figure 72.** Distribution map of the two-part serpentine fibulae of the variant I (●) and variant II (■); as it is shown on figure 71 (List 16).

a leaf-shaped hammered bow.<sup>591</sup> In recent overviews and analyses of fibulae in the form of a violin bow, the fibula from Novalja has not been included into the group of fibulae with two loops on the bow,<sup>592</sup> neither has it been included into the group of one-part serpentine fibulae of the so called Italian type.<sup>593</sup>

Despite that, the fibula from Novalja can be concretely classified exactly into the type of one-part serpentine fibulae with two loops and a straight pin. This is confirmed by its morphological features such as two large loops on the bow with a square cross-section, an elongated straight pin and a leaf-like and rhomboidal hammered bow with a central rib which is bent and elevated towards the loop on the foot of the fibula (cat. 40). Such fibulae were characteristic of the territory of southern Italy, and F. Lo Schiavo included them into her type 306 of homonymous fibulae.<sup>594</sup> They are mostly formed in the same manner with an undecorated rhomboidal hammered bow or decorated with embossing of simple linear motives of points and lines, as for example in Sala Consilina or Inconornata.<sup>595</sup> Since the foot was not preserved, one cannot rule out that its end was formed into a spirally wrapped disc, a form so popular in the fibulae of eastern Adriatic cultures and comparable to the ones from Inconornata and to type 309.<sup>596</sup> Still, it is clear that all the listed fibulae lack a central rib on the leaf-like bow. The latter is an element encountered in one-part fibulae with three loops from Salapia and Capua<sup>597</sup> and mostly in different types of serpentine fibulae on the territory of southern

<sup>596</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 377: 5386; T. 378: 5387.

<sup>597</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 370: 5288-5289.

<sup>598</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: 619-620.

<sup>599</sup> Glogović 2003: 8.

<sup>600</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1999: T. 31, 32.

<sup>601</sup> De Marinis, Gambari 2005: 199-200; Gambari 2006: 206-207.

<sup>602</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 143, Fig. 17; Glogović 1988a: 12-14, T. III: 1-2; Glogović 1989: 21; Glogović 2003: 48-49, T. 47: 358; Blečić 2007a: 111-112, Fig. 3; Blečić Kavr 2012b: 219-220, Sl. 9-10. Š. Batović je bio mišljenja kako je riječ o jednodijelnoj zmijastoj fibuli (Batović 1983: 310).

<sup>603</sup> Eles Masi 1986: T. 163: 2133, 2136; Salzani, Colonna 2010: T. 41: 3.

<sup>604</sup> Glogović 1988a; Glogović 1989: 19-21; Glogović 2003: 47-48, T. 47: 355, 356, 357, 362, 363A.

<sup>605</sup> Kilian 1971: 224, Abb. 3; Kilian 1985: 250, Fig. 5; Peroni 1976: 108.

<sup>606</sup> Glogović 1988a: 13-15; Glogović 2003: 48.

<sup>591</sup> Glogović 1991: 20, T. 3: 5; Glogović 2003: 7-8, T. 1: 6.

<sup>592</sup> Kašuba 2008: 208-217, Abb. 15.


<sup>593</sup> Dörner 2008: 570, fn. 166.

<sup>594</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 375: 5356-5360; T. 376: 5361-5369; T. 745.

<sup>595</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 375: 5356; T. 376: 5362.

<sup>596</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 377: 5386; T. 378: 5387.

<sup>597</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 370: 5288-5289.







**Slika 73.** Zmijaste fibule iz Piramatovaca (MGŠ, Foto: E. Podrug) i iz Jokine Glavice kod Krneze (prema Marijanović 2012).

**Figure 73.** Serpentine fibulae from Piramatovci (MGŠ, Photo: E. Podrug) and Jokina Glavica near Krneza (after Marijanović 2012).

je posredno početak želznoga doba Liburnije pomaknula i relativno usporedila s HaB1 stupnjem srednjoeuropske periodizacije, odnosno sa PF1 ili villanovskim horizontom Italije.

Drugi tip dvodijelne zmijaste fibule, zastupljen na predmetnom prostoru, onaj je s ravnom iglom lukovičasto oblikovane glavice, sa sedlastim lukom i spiralnim diskom na nozi. Bez iznimke, u dosadašnjim je studijama kao izravni import s italskog kopna obilježen tip fibule iz Klačenice (kat. 180), koja ima okrugli presjek luka.<sup>607</sup> Njezinoj igli s manjim trnom na kraju okruglasto oblikovane glavice, paralelu nalazimo kod igle iz Dragišića, grob 20.<sup>608</sup> Fibule pak iz Garice, s listasto proširenim lukom (kat 162),<sup>609</sup> Grižana, s rombičnim presjekom luka (kat. 175)<sup>610</sup> ili Novalje (kat. 41)<sup>611</sup> predstavljane su kao primjerci koji se uklapaju u fibule tzv. jadranske *koiné* (sl. 69: 5-8; 70-73).<sup>612</sup> Njima srodne fibule potječu iz Picenuma gdje obilježavaju I. stupanj njihove kulture<sup>613</sup> i zbog tog su tipološko-kronološkog kompariranja i fibule na istočnoj obali Jadrana, a koje nisu smatrane italskim importom nego radom domaćih obrtnika, uglavnom bile datirane u 9. stoljeće i po tome u I. fazu želznog doba Liburnije.<sup>614</sup>

Ideja Gera von Merharta kako se taj tip fibule u Italiji razvija pod snažnim utjecajima iz kompleksa KPŽ Podunavlja i Balkana,<sup>615</sup> bila je u potpunosti prihvaćena, izrazito tumačena u načinu i stilu

Italy. They were dated into the 10<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> century, the phase PF1,<sup>598</sup> which might be roughly applicable also to our fibula, as already determined by D. Glogović.<sup>599</sup>

Previously selected Italian contexts point at the rise of popularity of two-part serpentine fibulae with ribs or without them, which, as aforementioned, were typical of the so called Middle-Tyrrhenian facies of the final Protovillanova and the initial Villanova culture as well as of the large hoards of this period (BF3/PF1).<sup>600</sup> In contemporary discussions by Italian specialists, the two-part serpentine fibulae represent one of the basic utensils for solving the problem in the relative chronology of the transition from the Bronze into the Iron Age on the territory of northern Italy (Golasecca I, Este I) and its comparison to the beginning of the Villanova culture in central Italy. In absolute chronological terms, and on the territory to the North of the Po River, the elements of attire are long-lasting, and last much longer than on the territory of Bologna, which is why they were dated to the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> until the first half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Consequently, certain large necropoles must have been concurrent in their last phases of life with the I. phase of Bologna.<sup>601</sup>

Within the same chronological and cultural aspect also the single example of a two-part serpentine fibula with ribs from the eastern Adriatic coast coming from Osor should be observed (cat. 57-58, fig. 68: 3-4).<sup>602</sup> Since this find was considered as a direct italic import, the direct comparisons, with regard to the pronounced and strongly profiled ribs and the round head of the pin, could be seen in the fibulae from Angarano, Fontanella or from Narde in Fratessina.<sup>603</sup> In its potential production and chronological identity, and considering new findings from the Po Plain, the fibula from Osor should be regarded as a consequence of contacts with the north-Italian, mostly the Po Plain area, in the period of the Late Bronze Age – in the period of the late Protovillanovan and early Villanovan culture. If we take into consideration also other finds from this period, the early Villanovan culture

<sup>607</sup> Brunšmid 1901: 54, T. I: 5. Možda treba ipak spomenuti kako klačenička fibula ima sistem ulegnuća lučne noge u četvrtasto kućište jednako kao i fibule s prostora Liburnije, tj. s naglašeno izvučenom i svinutom nogom luka. Taj detalj kod italskih tipova zmijastih fibula nije uobičajen.

<sup>608</sup> Glogović 1988a: T. XIIIa: 14.

<sup>609</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1962: T. I: 1.

<sup>610</sup> Ljubić 1889: T. 10: 36.

<sup>611</sup> Batović 1973: T. CIII: 2.

<sup>612</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: 441-442, T. XXIX: 7-10; Glogović 1988a: 5-18, K. 1; Glogović 2003: 47-48, nr: 355-358, 362-363A. Za Italiju vidjeti: D' Ercole 1977: T. 33: B 345; Tocco 1978: 96-98, Fig. 4c; Eles Masi 1986: kat. 2126, 2128, 2131-2132; 2133, 2135-2138; D' Agostino, Gastaldi 1988: Fig. 57: 3, 149: 3; Salzani 1991: 125; Peroni 1992: 13-15; Pare 1998: 314, Abb. 9: 20, 23-24, 27; Cosentino 1999: 186, kat. 5; Mangani 2003: 298, T. VII: e.

<sup>613</sup> Lollini 1976: 122-125, Fig. 2: 1, 3; Pare 1998: 322-326, Abb. 13: 17, T. 2.

<sup>614</sup> Batović 1981: 99; Glogović 2003: 76. Novijim razmatranjem građe iz Picenuma te su fibule ipak svrstane u posljednje faze kasnog brončanog i prijelaza na početak želznoga doba, čime je korigiran početak I. faze kulture Picena (Pare 1998: 322-326, T. 2; Bietti Sestieri 1999: 39).

<sup>615</sup> Merhart 1942: 4-5, T. 2.

<sup>598</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: 619-620.

<sup>599</sup> Glogović 2003: 8.

<sup>600</sup> Carancini, Peroni 1999: T. 31, 32.

<sup>601</sup> De Marinis, Gambari 2005: 199-200; Gambari 2006: 206-207.

<sup>602</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 143, Fig. 17; Glogović 1988a: 12-14, T. III: 1-2; Glogović 1989: 21; Glogović 2003: 48-49, T. 47: 358; Blečić 2007a: 111-112, Fig. 3; Blečić Kavrur 2012b: 219-220, Sl. 9-10. Š. Batović thought that this was a one-part serpentine fibula (Batović 1983: 310).

<sup>603</sup> Eles Masi 1986: T. 163: 2133, 2136; Salzani, Colonna 2010: T. 41: 3.

preoblikovanja preuzetog motiva posebice kod tipologije igala.<sup>616</sup> U tom su smislu kod "jadranskih tipova" fibula igle s lukovičastom glavicom povezane uz oblike II. i III. faze KPŽ sjeverozapadne Hrvatske, pa osim kvarnerskih primjeraka (varijanta I.) njima je pribrojena i fibula iz Kompolja (sl. 69-70).<sup>617</sup> Lukovičaste glavice igala nisu rijetkost niti kod italskih fibula, osobito kod dvodijelnih zmijastih fibula s rebrima,<sup>618</sup> i vjerojatno im se može pribrojiti ulomak igle s lukovičastom glavicom, četvrtasto raskovanim i perforiranim vratom iz groba 111 nekropole Brežec (sl. 69).<sup>619</sup> Ona znatno podsjeća na iglu fibule iz Grižana i iz Biljana Donjih (sl. 69),<sup>620</sup> a obje svakako asociraju na iglu iz Frattesine.<sup>621</sup> Međutim, fibule s dugačkim zašiljenim trnom na glavici igle, i najčešće s urezanim ukrasom girlandi, potpuno su nepoznate na prostoru Apenina, a karakteristične su za liburnsko područje i bližu unutrašnjost (varijanta II), povezane uz moguće inspiracije oblika igala III. faze KPŽ sjeverozapadne Hrvatske (sl. 68-69).<sup>622</sup> Zanimljivo je ovdje svakako istaknuti i nalaz kalupa za takve igle iz Varvare, što je u određenoj analizi pokazao M. Gavranović.<sup>623</sup> Autor naime uspoređuje igle iz Velike Gorice, Donje Doline i Zemuna, koje obilježava bikonična glavica, uobičajeno sa središnjom facetom i s velikim šiljastim trnom na vrhu, ukrašavana s urezanim linijama ili girlandama, s kalupom iz Varvare, i s dvodijelnim zmijastim fibulama varijante II s obzirom na tipologiju igala. Sve njih usko povezuje, naravno u pokušaju argumentiranja kronoloških odrednica i kulturnih povezivanja, sa zmijastom dvodijelnom fibulom iz, upravo, Grižana i usprkos tomu što njezina igla ima izrazito lukovičasto obrađenu veliku glavicu. Naime, na prostoru Bosne nađena je jedna od varijanti te fibule i to u Drvaru,<sup>624</sup> ali glavica njezine igle ne završava lukovičasto, nego izrazito okruglo s hipertrofično dugačkim, zašiljenim trnom. Primamljivom svakako izgleda situacija njihovog prostornog razmještaja u kartiranom odnosu,<sup>625</sup> pri čemu tipološki ipak valja razlikovati igle, drugačije oblikovane i ukrašene glavice iz Velike Gorice, grob 7/1908,<sup>626</sup> koje pripadaju drugom tipu, izričito jajasto oblikovane glavice s malim trnom i ukrasom trostruke valovnice u središnjem dijelu, koja je kao takva tipičan element muške nošnje ruške skupine ali i grupe Velika Gorica/Dobova te šireg alpskog prostora.<sup>627</sup> Nešto sličnije su, ali opet ne identične, igle iz Zemuna, koje imaju bikoničnu glavicu sa stožastim trnom bez dodatnih ukrasa.<sup>628</sup> Temeļjem stratigrafskog nalaza kalupa iz Varvare, autor je sve igle, pa i

must have been not only chronologically parallel, but also contemporary, i.e. equal to the Italic cultures at least in terms of the communicational and ideological systems of interactive mutuality (fig. 69).

D. Glogović ambitiously and analytically observed the two-part serpentine fibulae from Kvarner and commented the traditionally accepted view points and hypotheses.<sup>604</sup> Accepting the opinions of previous researchers, she interpreted these fibulae as the "Adriatic type" that developed from Italian models.<sup>605</sup> She observed them within framework of the circulation of the Adriatic cultural *koiné*, as a reflection of intensive contacts between the eastern and the western Adriatic coast in the Late Bronze and the beginning of the Iron Age of Liburnia in the 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>606</sup> By doing so, she shifted and relatively compared the beginning of the Iron Age of Liburnia with the HaB1 phase of the European periodization, or, in other words, with PF1 or the Villanovan horizon of Italy.

Another type of two-part serpentine fibulae present on the area under discussion, is the one with a straight pin with an onion-shaped head, a saddle-like bow and a spiral disc on the foot. The fibula type with a circular cross-section of the bow, which was discovered in Klačenica, has been interpreted as a direct import from the Italic territory (cat. 180).<sup>607</sup> A parallel to its pin, with a short spike on the top of the circular-shaped head, could be observed in the pin from grave 20 from Dragišić.<sup>608</sup> Fibulae from Garica, with a leaf-shaped widened bow (cat. 162),<sup>609</sup> from Grižane, with a rhomboid cross-section of the bow (cat. 175),<sup>610</sup> and Novalja (cat. 41)<sup>611</sup> fit into the Adriatic *koiné* (fig. 69: 5-8; 70-73).<sup>612</sup> Similar fibulae are known from Picenum, where they mark the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of their culture.<sup>613</sup> Due to this typological and chronological comparison the fibulae on the opposite side of the Adriatic, which were not considered as imports but rather products of local artisans, were mostly dated into the 9<sup>th</sup> century and thus into the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the Liburnian Iron Age.<sup>614</sup>

The idea by Gero von Merhart that this type of fibulae developed in Italy under strong influences from the complex of the Urnfield culture from the Danube Basin and the Balkans<sup>615</sup> was entirely accepted and clearly interpreted in the mode and style of the transformation of the accepted motive, in particular at the typology of the pins.<sup>616</sup> In

<sup>616</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1962; Glogović 1988a: 8-15; Glogović 1989: 20; Hiller 1991: 79-82, Abb. 24.

<sup>617</sup> Glogović 1988a: T. II: 2.

<sup>618</sup> Usp. Salzani, Colonna 2010: T. VII: 26; T. 20: 2; T. 41: 3; Eles Masi 1986: T. 163: 2136, 2138. Fibula iz Frattesine (T. 163: 2139) najvjerojatnije neće pripadati zmijastim fibulama s rebrima, već dvodijelnim fibulama s diskom na nozi, što sugerira izradba glavice igle, njezine perforacije za umetanje luka, kao i ukrasa od samo jednog rebra.

<sup>619</sup> Vitri 1977: T. IX: T. 111: 1; Gabrovec 1987b: 155.

<sup>620</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: 441, T. XXIX: 8.

<sup>621</sup> Bellintani, Peretto 1984: T. III: 12; Eles Masi 1986: T. 163: 2139.

<sup>622</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1962; Glogović 1988a: 8, 10.

<sup>623</sup> Gavranović 2011/I: 165, Abb. 162: 20; 2011/II: K. 54; usp. Ludajić 2005: 66, T. III: 1a.

<sup>624</sup> Glogović 1988: 8-10; usp. Teržan 2009: 221, Sl. 5; Gavranović 2011/I: K. 54.

<sup>625</sup> Autor kartira i fibulu iz nepoznatog nalazišta koja se čuva u AMS prilično pristrano, povlačeći je više prema unutrašnjosti zaleđa, kako bi odgovarala željenoj prostornoj "slici".

<sup>626</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: T. 102: 16; T. 103: 6; usp. Karvanić 2009: 58-59, T. 51: 15.

<sup>627</sup> B. Teržan također usporedbom približava igle iz Donje Doline s iglom iz groba 7/1908 iz Velike Gorice (Teržan 2009: 219). Za kronologiju tih igala vidjeti i kod Rychner 1995: 455; Pare 1998: 343, Abb. 24: 7.

<sup>628</sup> Na tu je usporedbu ukazao R. Vasić smatrajući te igle reakcijom određenoga lokalizma na utjecaje iz kulturnog kompleksa KPŽ (Vasić 2003: 63, T. 23: 349-350).

<sup>604</sup> Glogović 1988a; Glogović 1989: 19-21; Glogović 2003: 75-76, T. 47: 355, 356, 357, 362, 363A.

<sup>605</sup> Kilian 1971: 224, Abb. 3; Kilian 1985: 250, Fig. 5; Peroni 1976: 108.

<sup>606</sup> Glogović 1988a: 13-15; Glogović 2003: 48.

<sup>607</sup> Brunšmid 1901: 54, T. I: 5. Perhaps one should stress that the fibula from Klačenica has got the system of the fixation of the foot of the bow in to the square box formed in a same way as the fibulae from the territory of Liburnia – with an accentuated pulled out and bent foot of the bow, which is not a common form in the fibulae from Italy.

<sup>608</sup> Glogović 1988a: T. XIIIa: 14.

<sup>609</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1962: T. I: 1.

<sup>610</sup> Ljubić 1889: T. 10: 36.

<sup>611</sup> Batović 1973: T. CIII: 2.


<sup>612</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: 441-442, T. XXIX: 7-10; Glogović 1988a: 5-18, K. 1; Glogović 2003: 47-48, nr. 355-358, 362-363A. For Italy see: D' Ercole 1977: T. 33: B 345; Tocco 1978: 96-98, Fig. 4c; Eles Masi 1986: cat. 2126, 2128, 2131-2132; 2133, 2135-2138; D' Agostino, Gastaldi 1988: Fig. 57: 3, 149: 3; Salzani 1991: 125; Peroni 1992: 13-15; Pare 1998: 314, Abb. 9: 20, 23-24, 27; Cosentino 1999: 186, cat. 5; Mangani 2003: 298, T. VII: e.

<sup>613</sup> Lollini 1976: 122-125, Fig. 2: 1, 3; Pare 1998: 322-326, Abb. 13: 17, Tab. 2.

<sup>614</sup> Batović 1981: 99; Glogović 2003: 76. In recent considerations of the finds from Picenum these fibulae were included in to the last phase of Late Bronze and the transition in to the beginning of Iron Age which corrected the beginning of the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the Picenian culture (Pare 1998: 322-326, T. 2; Bietti Sestieri 1999: 39).

<sup>615</sup> Merhart 1942: 4-5, T. 2.

<sup>616</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1962; Glogović 1988a: 8-15; Glogović 1989: 20; Hiller 1991: 79-82, Abb. 24.



**Slika 74.** Grobna cjelina 148 bogatog muškog groba iz Terni (prema Müller-Karpe 1959).

**Figure 74.** Inventory of the grave 148 from the necropolis in Terni (after Müller-Karpe 1959).

fibule, datirao u stupanj HaB1, uspoređujući ih u dataciji s nalazima iz Italije, što je u generalnoj formi analize predmetnih fibula već bila primijenila D. Glogović. No fibule koje imaju dugačak, zašiljen trn na glavici igle, potpuno odstupaju od primjerka iz Grižane, čija se usporedba u tome smislu ne čini najsretnijom. Ostaje svakako činjenicom da su izdvojene igle s bikoničnom glavicom i šiljastim trnom iz Donje Doline relativno usko datirane, a dodajući im nalaz iste igle iz Kompolja, grob 208,<sup>629</sup> možemo ih također smatrati preuređenim elementima široko rasprostranjene mode HaB horizonta, tj. od 11. pa do 9. stoljeća korigirane periodizacije.

Svepoznatim jadranskim nalazima pridružiti se može još jedna fibula iz Piramatovca-Roguše, koja doduše ima poznatiji kontekst nalaženja, ali, nažalost, bez značajnije kronološke vrijednosti (sl. 73: 1).<sup>630</sup> Naime, fibula je dijelom oštećena te joj nedostaje glavica igle, zbog čega je i bliže svrstavanje pojedinoj varijanti otežano (I ili II s obzirom na tipologiju glavica igala) (sl. 72). Ipak, oblikovanje njezina luka i spiralno namotanog diska na nozi, kao i ukras od urezanih snopova paralelnih linija, neodoljivo podsjeća na fibulu iz Klačenice. Tako nas fibule iz Piramatovca i Klačenice, koje možemo postaviti u kronološkoj usporedbi, mogu vrlo brzo podsjetiti na način ukrašavanja i izvedbu luka koji je pak najviše bio u primjeni kod jednodijelnih italskih fibula sa spiralnim diskom na nozi,<sup>631</sup> a ne kod dvodijelnih zmijastih fibula koje uostalom više

that sense, the "Adriatic types" of fibulae with an onion-shaped head were linked to the forms of the II<sup>nd</sup> and III<sup>rd</sup> phase of the Urnfield culture of north-western Croatia, and alongwith the fibulae from Kvarner (variant I), the find from Kompolje was added to them (fig. 69-70).<sup>617</sup> Onion-shaped heads were not rare at Italian fibulae, especially in two-part serpentine fibulae with ribs,<sup>618</sup> and probably also the pin fragment with an onion-shaped head and a square hammered and perforated neck from grave 111 from the Brežec necropolis could be added to them (fig. 69).<sup>619</sup> This pin exhibits similarities to the one of the fibula from Grižane and Biljani Donji (fig. 69),<sup>620</sup> and both can be definitely associated in terms of a similar appearance to the Frattesina pin.<sup>621</sup>

However, fibulae with a long point at the head of the pin and often an incised decoration of garlands are completely unknown on the territory of the Apennine, but are characteristic of the Liburnian territory and its narrow hinterlands (variant II), connected to the pins of the III<sup>th</sup> phase of the Urnfield culture of north-western Croatia (fig. 68-69).<sup>622</sup> It is interesting to mention the discovery of a mold for such a pin from Varvara, as demonstrated in the analysis by M. Gavranović.<sup>623</sup> In fact, the author compares the pins from Velika Gorica, Donja Dolina and Zemun – characterized by a byconical head, commonly with a central facete, a big pointed thorn on the top and decorated with incised lines or garlands, besides the mold from Varvara – with pins from two-part serpentine fibulae of the II<sup>nd</sup> variant. Gavranović links them all closely together, of course in the attempt at providing arguments for the chronological position and the cultural connections with the two-part serpentine fibula from Grižane, despite the fact that the latter has an extremely onion-shaped big head. However, on the territory of Bosnia, another variant of these fibulae was discovered in Drvar<sup>624</sup> – the head of its pin does not end in an onion-shaped form but in a round head with an extremely long pointed thorn on the top. In any case, the situation of their spatial distribution looks tempting,<sup>625</sup> but we have to distinguish the pins, formed differently and with decorated heads such as those from Velika Gorica, grave 7/1908,<sup>626</sup> which should be included into another type with a clearly egg-shaped head, with a small thorn on top and decorated with the ornament of a triple undulating line in the central part, which are a typical element of male attire in the Ruše group, but also in the Velika Gorica/Dobova group and the broader Alpine area.<sup>627</sup> Slightly more similar, but still not identical, are the pins from Zemun, that have a byconical head

<sup>617</sup> Glogović 1988a: T. II: 2.

<sup>618</sup> Comp. Salzani, Colonna 2010: T. VII: 26; T. 20: 2; T. 41: 3; Eles Masi 1986: T. 163: 2136, 2138. Fibula from Frattesina (T. 163: 2139) most probably does not belong to serpentine fibulae with ribs, but to two-part fibulae with a disc on the foot. The latter could be assumed due to the fabrication of the head, its perforation for the insertion of the bow, as well as the decoration of a single rib.

<sup>619</sup> Vitri 1977: T. IX: T. 111: 1; Gabrovec 1987: 155.

<sup>620</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: 441, T. XXIX: 8.

<sup>621</sup> Bellintani, Peretto 1984: T. III: 12; Eles Masi 1986: T. 163: 2139.

<sup>622</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1962; Glogović 1988a: 8, 10.

<sup>623</sup> Gavranović 2011/I: 165, Abb. 162: 20; 2011/II: K. 54; comp. Ludajić 2005: 66, T. III: 1a.

<sup>624</sup> Glogović 1988: 8-10; comp. Teržan 2009: 221, Sl. 5; Gavranović 2011/I: K. 54.

<sup>625</sup> The author has mapped also the fibula of an unknown place of origin, which is kept at the AMS, in a relatively biased way by placing it more towards the hinterlands, and making it thus fit the desired "picture".

<sup>626</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: T. 102: 16; T. 103: 6; comp. Karvanić 2009: 58-59, T. 51: 15.

<sup>627</sup> B. Teržan also compared the pins from Donja Dolina with the pin from grave 7/1908 from Velika Gorica (Teržan 2009: 219). For the chronology of these pins see Rychner 1995: 455; Pare 1998: 343, Abb. 24: 7.

<sup>629</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: T. I: 3.

<sup>630</sup> Kosturni ukop: fibula i brončano dugme. Istraživanja Muzeja Grada Šibenika 2000. godine.

<sup>631</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 378: 5389-5400; T. 379: 5401-5411, s brojnim inačicama i varijacijama na temu.

niti nemaju spiralno namotan disk, već je izrazito stanjen i plošan, evocirajući na nekadašnju spiralu, ili čak u potpunosti reduciran i zamijenjen limenim diskom.<sup>632</sup>

Kao izrazito zanimljivu novost valja izdvojiti i fibulu istih obilježja iz tumula Jokina glavica, grob 2, kod Ljubča (sl. 73: 2; 72). Riječ je o doista neobičnoj formi tog tipa fibule, do sada nepoznate na prostoru istočne obale Jadrana. Fibula ima sedlasto pseudotordirano oblikovan luk, mali spiralno namotani disk na kraju noge i ravnu iglu s malim kućištem za nogu luka. Igla je bogato ukrašena sa dva usporedno postavljena perforirana diska, a na samom kraju nalazi se velika kuglasta glava sastavljena od dva limena istovjetna konkavna dijela, ukrašena iskucavanjem s ispupčenjima i motivima koncentričnih kružnica.<sup>633</sup> Pa iako Brunislav Marijanović smatra da se u osnovnoj tipološkoj analizi može uspoređivati s poznatim istočnojadranskim primjercima dvodijelnih zmijastih fibula, o kojima iznosi i uglavnom prihvaćena mišljenja iz starije literature,<sup>634</sup> na kraju je ipak određuje kao usamljeni primjerak bez određenijeg stava u odnosu na moguće podrijetlo, provenijenciju izradbe ili kronološku poziciju.<sup>635</sup> U svakom pogledu fibula ima nekoliko konstruktivnih i tehnoloških rješenja koje je izdvajaju iz "društva" ionako klasificiranih fibula s prostora jadranskih kultura (sl. 69-70). Povrh neobično izrađene glave igle, popravljena je i petlja prema nozi fibule, izrađena posebnim i dorade-nim zadebljanjem, a luk je raščlanjen u tri dijela, odnosno s vanjskih su strana zakovicama pridodana dva "lažna pseudotordirana luka".<sup>636</sup> Morfološki i specifičnošću konstrukcijskih elemenata fibuli možemo izdvojiti nekoliko usporedbi s italskog prostora. S obzirom na oblik i ukras glave, kao najrodnija se izdvaja fibula iz Italije(?),<sup>637</sup> zatim oštećena fibula s rebrima iz Villamarzane,<sup>638</sup> fibula iz Celano Paludi<sup>639</sup> te djelomice, oštećena, fibula iz Pontecagnana.<sup>640</sup> Nadalje, s obzirom na izvedu raščlanjenog luka mogu se pak izdvojiti fibule iz Sala Consilina, koje na isti način imaju razdijeljen luk, doduše samo sa dva luka. Od toga je jedna fibula završavala upravo većom glavom spojenom od dva jednaka limena dijela, što će i postati obilježje velikih zmijastih fibula "a carrettino".<sup>641</sup> Kada bi fibulu promatrali isključivo u profilu, srodnosti su neizbježne i s primjerkom iz jadranskog Monte Saracena, te iz Cumae i južne Italije.<sup>642</sup> Napokon, pseudotordiranjem ili urezivanjem ukrašavanje luka i nožice karakteristično je za područje južne i srednje Italije, posebno Cumae i Terni (sl. 74) još od jednodijelnih varijanti zmijastih fibula, što se isto odnosi na oblikovanje glave iz šireg umbrijskog teritorija. S obzirom na navedene analogije fibula ipak predstavlja neku mjesnu, tj. hibridnu varijantu koja je najvjerojatnije ustaljenim vezama s Apulijom prenesena i na liburnsko područje, a s obzirom na njihove datacije, to se moralo dogoditi u vremenu konačne faze kasnog brončanog doba ili na samom početku željeznog doba BF3/PF1 horizonta.<sup>643</sup>

Donekle u istom smjeru, italskom importu mogla bi se pripisati i grizanska fibula, što je zapravo smatrao još i K. Kilian,<sup>644</sup> dok je D.

with a cone-shaped thorn with no additional decoration.<sup>628</sup> Due to the stratigraphy of the discovered mold from Varvara the author dated all the pins, and also the fibulae, into HaB1, comparing them in the datings to the finds from Italy, which was already applied in a more general form by D. Glogović. However, the fibulae with a long, pointed thorn on the top of the head significantly differ from the example from Grižane, making such a comparison a less successful one. Still, as a matter of fact, the identified pins with a byconical head and a pointed thorn on top from Donja Dolina are relatively closely dated, and by adding to that group the find of an identical pin from grave 208 in Kompolje,<sup>629</sup> we can consider them as an element of the broadly spread fashion of the HaB horizon, i.e. from the end of 11<sup>th</sup> until the 9<sup>th</sup> century of the corrected periodization.

Another fibula from Primatovci-Roguša, with a known context of discovery, but no significant chronological importance (fig. 73: 1) could be included into the known sites around the Adriatic.<sup>630</sup> Unfortunately, the fibula is partly damaged and its head is missing so that it is not possible to determine its variant (I or II according to the typology of the head) (fig. 72). Still, the form of its bow and the spirally rolled-up disc on the foot, as well as the decoration of incised sheaves of parallel lines, resemble the fibula from Klačenica. Thus, the fibulae from Piramatovci and Klačenica, which might be chronologically compared, could easily remind of the decoration mode and the fabrication of the bow mostly used in one-part italic fibulae with a spiral disc on the foot,<sup>631</sup> and not in two-part serpentine fibulae that no longer have the spirally rolled-up disc, which is either thinned and flattened, resembling to a spiral, or is completely reduced and replaced by a metal sheet disc.<sup>632</sup>

As an extremely interesting novelty the one fibula must be singled out which displays the same characteristics as in grave 2 of the tumulus in Jokina glavica near Ljubač (fig. 73: 2; 72). It is indeed a strange form for this type of fibulae unknown until then on the territory of the eastern coast of the Adriatic. The fibula has a saddle formed pseudo twisted bow, a small rolled-up disc on the end of the foot, and a straight pin with a small attachment for the foot of the bow. The pin is decorated with two parallel positioned perforated discs, and at its very end a large spherical head, made of two metal sheet concave parts decorated with hammered bulges and concentric circles.<sup>633</sup> Although Brunislav Marijanović considers that in the basic typological analysis it can be compared to known examples of two-part serpentine fibulae from the eastern Adriatic area, about which he presented mainly accepted opinions in the older literature,<sup>634</sup> in the end, he regards it as an isolated example with no specific position concerning its possible origin, manufacture provenience or chronological position.<sup>635</sup> In any way, the fibula features several constructive and technological solutions which distinguish it from the "company" of other fibulae from the territory of Adriatic cultures (fig. 69-70). Beside the unusual construction of the head, the tie towards the foot is repaired, made with a special and completed thickening, whereas its bow is separated into three parts, on the outer side are

<sup>632</sup> Npr. usp. kod Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 390; T. 391.

<sup>633</sup> Marijanović 2012: 23-25, T. II: 2a-b; T. III; T. IV.

<sup>634</sup> Marijanović 2012: 30-32.

<sup>635</sup> Marijanović 2012: 33.

<sup>636</sup> Marijanović 2012: 23-24, T. III; T. IV.

<sup>637</sup> Čus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 5: 6.

<sup>638</sup> Salzani 2001: 29, Fig. 2: 6.

<sup>639</sup> Nijboer, Plicht 2008: 108, Fig. 6.1.b.

<sup>640</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 396: 5524C.

<sup>641</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: 652, T. 402: 5548-5549; T. 403-T. 407.

<sup>642</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 393: 5504B-5506.

<sup>643</sup> Tumuli iz Celana datirani su i radiometričkim i dendro datacijama koje svjedoče o godinama oko 1000. i početku željeznog doba uokolo 950. godine. Nijboer, Plicht 2008: 105, 108; Lo Schiavo 2010: 652.

<sup>644</sup> Kilian 1973: 28, K. 2.

<sup>628</sup> This comparison was demonstrated already by R. Vasić considering the pins as a specific local reaction in the influences from the cultural circle of the Urnfield culture (Vasić 2003: 63, T. 23: 349-350).

<sup>629</sup> Lo Schiavo 1970: T. I: 3.

<sup>630</sup> Grave with a skeletal inhumation containing a fibula and a bronze button. Excavations by Muzej Grada Šibenika in the year 2000.

<sup>631</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 378: 5389-5400; T. 379: 5401-5411, with numerous variants and variations to the theme.

<sup>632</sup> For example see the comparisons in Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 390; T. 391.

<sup>633</sup> Marijanović 2012: 23-25, T. II: 2a-b; T. III; T. IV.

<sup>634</sup> Marijanović 2012: 30-32.

<sup>635</sup> Marijanović 2012: 33.

Glogović navedenu mogućnost ostavila otvorenom, povezujući fibulu također uz najbolje paralele u nekropoli Terni (sl. 74).<sup>645</sup> Ondje su te fibule, datirane u 10. (i početak 9.) stoljeća, prihvaćene kao obilježje začetka PF1 stupnja ekskluzivnih muških grobova posebnog društveno-političko-ekonomskog statusa.<sup>646</sup>

Međutim, gotovo identičnu izvedbu urezanog ukrasa paralelnim snopovima linija koje tvore rombične metope poznajemo kod male lučne fibule sa spiralnim diskom na nozi iz nekropole Colombare, grob 96 (sl. 65), a već je prije uspoređen sa zmijskim tropetljastim fibulama četverokutnog okvira istog presjeka luka iz Bismatove i Fontanelle.<sup>647</sup> Stoga se sjeverniji predjeli Italije, kako prema učestalom motivu ukrasa luka tako i sukladno rasprostranju novih nalaza toga tipa fibula osobito uz nizinu rijeke Po, a koje je i inače sasvim konkretno i u kontinuitetu povezano s prostorom Kvarnera, i bez obzira na virtualno ili trenutno odsustvo tih fibula na prostoru *Caput Adriae*, ne smiju isključiti iz određene posredničke uloge vjerojatno filtriranja importa karakterističnih za srednjotirenski kulturni ambijent.

Iz Kilianovog korpusa fantomskog "jadranskog tipa"<sup>648</sup> fibula D. Glogović je s pravom izdvojila i fibule s okruglim presjekom luka iz Kompolja i iz Benkovca, te fibule iz Bilaja i iz nepoznatog nalazišta, jer im noga završava žljebasto a ne u obliku spiralnog diska (sl. 65; 68).<sup>649</sup> Tako bi u "jadranski tip" s prostora Kvarnera ulazila samo fibula iz Garice i, eventualno, ulomak fibule iz Novalje, pored ostala dva primjeraka iz Nina i Drvara (sl. 68; 71). Smatrane su proizvodima domaćih radionica i stoga kronološki mlađe od onih fibula koje su kao italiski importi smatrane inspiracijama za razvoj lokalnih tipova.<sup>650</sup>

Izuzev oblika fibula te njezinih indikativnih tipoloških obilježja glede završetka noge, ukrasa luka i izvedbe glave igle, raščlambu fibula s obzirom na izvedbu luka pokazala je već i R. Drechsler-Bižić.<sup>651</sup> Poblizje se, na varijantu sa sedlastim i to listasto raskovanim lukom, osvrnula B. Teržan<sup>652</sup> koja ih pak dijeli u dvije varijante, ali tada temeljem razlikovnosti noge! Smatrajući sve predmetne varijante dijelom ženskog nakita, unatoč vrlo oskudnim poznatim kontekstima, pridaje ima poseban mogući značaj kao ukrasa za glavu.<sup>653</sup> Usprkos tomu što primjerak iz Garice nema očuvanu nogu i zadnji dio luka, kod obje je autorice izgleda, sam po sebi, ubrojen u prvu varijantu sa završetkom noge u obliku spiralnog diska!? Isto tako uspoređivana su s višedijelnim fibulama tipa Prozor koje tipološki odgovaraju drugom, u odnosu na predmetne, i znatno mlađem tipu fibule. Je li moguće u njima pratiti razvojni

wit rivets added two "false pseudo-twisted bows".<sup>636</sup> With respect to its morphology and construction elements several comparisons can be made with the fibulae coming from the Italic territory. As most similar in terms of the head form and decoration, a fibula from Italy(?) should be mentioned,<sup>637</sup> a damaged fibula with ribs from Villamarzana,<sup>638</sup> a damaged fibula with ribs from Celano Paludi,<sup>639</sup> and a damaged fibula from Pontecagnano.<sup>640</sup> In addition, by observing the production of the bow, the fibulae from Sala Consilina should be singled out which demonstrate a similarly performed division of the bow; however they have only two bows. One of them ends with a larger head made of two fused similar parts of sheet metal, a feature that will become typical of the large serpentine fibulae "a carrettino".<sup>641</sup> If we observed the fibula exclusively from the side, the similarities with the example from the Adriatic Monte Saraceno, from Cumae, and from southern Italy would be inevitable.<sup>642</sup> Finally, either pseudo-twisted or incised the decorating of the bow and of the foot is a characteristic of the territory of southern and central Italy, especially of Cumae and Terni (fig. 74) and this already from the time of one-part serpentine fibulae, which also applies to the shaping of the head on the broader Umbrian territory. Considering the given analogies, the fibula presents an Italian local, hybrid variant, most probably transferred onto the Liburnian territory via stabile connections with Apulia. Based on the dating of comparable finds, this must have happened in the period of the end of Late Bronze Age or the beginning of Early Iron Age in the BF3/PF1 horizon.<sup>643</sup>

Also the fibula from Grižane could be defined as an Italic import, as proposed by K. Kilian,<sup>644</sup> while D. Glogović did not resolve its origin, although she connected it to the fibulae from the necropolis of Terni (fig. 74).<sup>645</sup> There, they were dated into the 10<sup>th</sup> (and the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup>) century and placed as characteristic of the beginning of the PF1 phase of exclusively male graves belonging to such deceased that had a special social, political and economic status.<sup>646</sup>

Meanwhile, an almost identical realization of incised ornament with parallel sheaves of lines forming rhomboidal metopes is known from the small bow fibulae with a spiral disc on the foot from the necropolis of Colombara, grave 96 (fig. 65). This ornament has already been compared earlier to the serpentine three-looped fibulae with a square frame, and a square cross-section of the bow, from Bismatova and Fontanella.<sup>647</sup> Thus, both in terms of the recurrent motives of decoration and the distribution of new finds of this type of fibulae, especially in the Po Plain, concretely and uninterruptedly connected to the Kvarner area, and this regardless of their virtual or temporary absence of such fibulae on the territory of *Caput Adriae*, the northern territories of Italy must not be excluded from a specific mediating

<sup>645</sup> Leonelli 2003: 174-175. Vrlo slična fibula, tehnološkom izradbom i urezanim ukrasom na nozi, nalazi se u RGZM (Naso 2003: 214-215, Fig. 98) (sl. 71). Isto tako, zanimljiva je pojava takve fibule u Landesmuseum Joanneum u Grazu, za koju se navodi da potječe iz Slovenije (Karl, Modl, Porod 2009: 136, kat. 765), mada će ona vjerojatnije imati italisko podrijetlo?

<sup>646</sup> Pacciarelli 2001: 250-251, 255, Fig. 136; Leonelli 2003: 312, 314, 322.

<sup>647</sup> Glogović 1989: 20. O tim fibulama vidjeti i kod A. Nasa (2003: 209, Fig. 89).

<sup>648</sup> Zbunjujuće je u svakom slučaju, ili najmanje nejasno, da K. Kilian kartira zmijske fibule italiskog tipa starijeg željeznog doba, a da niti jedna takva fibula nije kartirana na prostoru Italije. Naime, u tu su grupu fibula, prema istome autoru, ubrojene fibule iz Grižana, Klačenice i Nina te koljenasta fibula iz Škocjana, koje tipološki ne čine homogenu cjelinu. Ostale fibule koje navodi, teže su provjerljive budući da se ne navode u katalozima *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* T. Badera i D. Gergove, a potječu iz Köszeg, Cernatu, Vidina i Breznika, te posljednja iz Chanije na Kreti (Kilian 1973: 28, K. 2!)

<sup>649</sup> Glogović 1988a: 7, T. I, II; Glogović 1989: 20.

<sup>650</sup> Glogović 1988a: 16; Glogović 2003: 48.

<sup>651</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1962: 299-300.

<sup>652</sup> Teržan 2009: 216-223.

<sup>653</sup> Teržan 2009: 219-222.

<sup>636</sup> Marijanović 2012: 23-24, T. III; T. IV.

<sup>637</sup> Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 5: 6.

<sup>638</sup> Salzani 2001: 29, Fig. 2: 6.

<sup>639</sup> Nijboer, Plicht 2008: 108, Fig. 6.1.b.

<sup>640</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 396: 5524C.

<sup>641</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: 652, T. 402: 5548-5549; T. 403-T. 407.

<sup>642</sup> Lo Schiavo 2010: T. 393: 5504B-5506.


<sup>643</sup> Tumuli from Celano were dated with radiometric and dendrochronological methods. The results demonstrate an age around 1000 and the beginning of Iron Age around 950 BC. Nijboer, Plicht 2008: 105, 108; Lo Schiavo 2010: 652.

<sup>644</sup> Kilian 1973: 28, K. 2.

<sup>645</sup> Leonelli 2003: 174-175. A similar fibula, produced with the same technology and with the same decoration incised on the foot, is kept at the RGZM (Naso 2003: 214-215, Fig. 98) (fig. 71). Also interesting is the appearance of such a fibula in the Landesmuseum Joanneum in Graz where it is noted that it supposedly originates from Slovenia (Karl, Modl, Porod 2009: 136, kat. 765) although it most probably came from Italy?

<sup>646</sup> Pacciarelli 2001: 250-251, 255, Fig. 136; Leonelli 2003: 312, 314, 322.

<sup>647</sup> Glogović 1989: 20. Regarding these fibulae see A. Naso (2003: 209, Fig. 89).



**Slika 75.** Tarquinija, inventar groba 25 nekropole Poggio dell'Impiccato (prema Bianco Peroni 1979).

**Figure 75.** Tarquinia, inventory of grave 25 from the necropolis of Poggio dell'Impiccato (after Bianco Peroni 1979).

put, kako je to mislila R. Drechsler-Bižić<sup>654</sup> teško je reći sa sigurnošću. Bitno, naime, jest, da se kod višedijelne fibule tipa Prozor svakako može prepoznati mnoštvo utjecaja, koji su se odražavali od izvedbe luka, preko noga, do spirala i napokon do korištenja same igle koja je pridružena tipu Moravičany i već je bila predmetom mnogih studija.<sup>655</sup> Doista, fibule s listasto raskovanim lukom predstavljaju određenu gustoću nalaza u odnosu na one fibule puno lijevanog luka. No koncentracija potonjih zabilježena je upravo na prostoru Kvarnera i najvjerojatnije će također kronološki stajati na nešto višoj poziciji.

Napokon, ako se naše fibule promatraju iz aspekta oblikovanja igala onda se jasno izdvaja regionalno-obrtnički krug oko liburnskih primjeraka i onih s kvarnerskog prostora (sl. 68). Zbog toga su fibule iz Grižana i Garice promatrane u istom tipološkom i kronološkom okviru, i prema Š. Batoviću datirane nešto više od ostalih primjeraka, u kasno brončano doba Liburnije.<sup>656</sup>

Fibula iz Grižana (kat. 175) svakako predstavlja zanimljiv "slučaj" u studijama koje su se bavile tom problematikom, budući da su okolnosti njezina nalaza sporne. Naime, ukoliko želimo prihvatiti jedinstvenost grobne cjeline, tada je to moguće samo onako kako nam ga je prenio Š. Ljubić,<sup>657</sup> a ne kako ga je legitimizirao Š. Batović.<sup>658</sup> Potonji je autor naime udružio različite tipove fibula u jednu cjelinu koja je kao takva odražavala iznimno neobičnu nošnju tog dijela Kvarnera, ne samo fizičkog već i simboličkog značenja, kombinacije autohtonih i alohtonih elemenata. Po toj je kombinaciji naime ispalo, da su velike lučne fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku i narukvice dvoslivnog presjeka mogle biti dijelom istovremene sa zmijastom dvodijelnom fibulom, koje bi vremenski obuhvaćale raspon od 12. do 10. stoljeća, a što je nekako akcentirao i C. F. E. Pare.<sup>659</sup> Promišljeno, takva situacija podsjeća na spomenuti grob 272 iz nekropole Brežec kojeg isti autor, baš kao i *grobni nalaz iz Grižana*, datira u kasnobrončano doba.<sup>660</sup> Isto je također, kako smo već vidjeli, imalo posljedica i kod interpretacija gradiva iz središnje Bosne.<sup>661</sup> No ukoliko sumnjamo u autentičnosti grobne cjeline na *Batovićev način*, što je na neki način i bio stav D. Glogović,<sup>662</sup> te dosljedno slijedimo Ljubićevu objavu i opis u kome točno stoji kako je u grobu na Grižanama kod Triblja bila: velika lučna fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, narukvice dvoslivnog presjeka i igla s lukovičastom glavicom, kratko očuvanog vrata, tada se pred nama

role, most probably, of filtering the imports characteristic of the central Tyrrhenian cultural ambience.

From Killian's phantomlike "Adriatic type" corpus<sup>648</sup> of fibulae, D. Glogović singled out the fibulae with a circular cross-section of the bow from Kopolje and Benkovac, and the fibulae from Biljane and from an unknown locality, having a gutter-like end of a foot instead of a spiral disc (fig. 65; 68).<sup>649</sup> From the Kvarner territory, only the Garica fibulae and possibly the fragment from Novalja could fit, together with the two examples from Nin and Drvar, into the "Adriatic type" (fig. 68; 71). They could be products of local workshops and thus chronologically younger than those fibulae considered to be Italic imports and as such an inspiration for the development of local types.<sup>650</sup>

Beside the form of fibulae and its indicative typological characteristics such as the ending of the foot, the decoration of the bow and the forming of the head, R. Drechsler-Bižić proposed a division of fibulae based on the construction of the bow.<sup>651</sup> B. Teržan discussed in detail the variant with the saddle-shaped and leaf-like hammered bow<sup>652</sup> subdividing it into two variants based, this time, on the differences in the foot! By considering all given variants as parts of female attire, despite very poor contexts, Teržan attributed a special significance to them as a possible form of headdress.<sup>653</sup> Despite the fact that the example from Garica lacks the foot and the hind part of the bow, both authors included it into the first variant provided with the ending of the foot in the form of a spiral disc! In the same way, it was compared with composite fibulae of the Prozor type which typologically correspond to the second and significantly younger type, compared to the already discussed ones. It is difficult to tell whether the evolutionary path may be followed in them, as assumed by R. Drechsler-Bižić.<sup>654</sup> However, it is important that a multitude of influences may be recognized in the Prozor type fibulae, which are reflected in the execution of the bow, the foot, the spiral and finally in the use of the pin, which belonging to the Moravičany type has already been the subject-matter of numerous studies.<sup>655</sup>

<sup>648</sup> Confusing or at least unclear is the fact that K. Killian mapped the Early Iron Age serpentine fibulae of the Italian type without mapping a single find on the territory of Italy. According to author's opinion, into this group the fibulae from Grižane, Klačenica and Nin are included, as well as the one-part serpentine fibula from Škočjan, which do not form a typologically homogeneous unity. Other fibulae mentioned are hard to examine since they are not listed in the catalogues of the *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* by T. Bader and D. Gergova. They should originate from Köszeg, Cernatu, Vidin and Breznik while the last one comes from Chania on Crete (Killian 1973a: 28, K. 2!)

<sup>649</sup> Glogović 1988a: 7, T. I, II; Glogović 1989: 20.

<sup>650</sup> Glogović 1988a: 16; Glogović 2003: 48.

<sup>651</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1962: 299-300.

<sup>652</sup> Teržan 2009: 216-223.

<sup>653</sup> Teržan 2009: 219-222.

<sup>654</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1962: T. VIII.

<sup>655</sup> Comp. Pabst 2009: 8, f.n. 15; Pabst 2012: 61; Teržan 2009: 219; Gavranović 2011/I: 166.

<sup>654</sup> Drechsler-Bižić 1962: T. VIII.

<sup>655</sup> Usp. Pabst 2009: 8, f.n. 15; Pabst 2012: 61; Teržan 2009: 219; Gavranović 2011/I: 166.

<sup>656</sup> Batović 1981: 94, 96; Batović 1983: 310.

<sup>657</sup> Ljubić 1876; Ljubić 1889: 72, T. 10: 36.

<sup>658</sup> Batović 1981: 94.

<sup>659</sup> Pare 1998: 329.

<sup>660</sup> Pare 1998: 327-328; usp. Della Casa 1996: 150.

<sup>661</sup> Gavranović 2011/I: 206, Abb. 199. Isto se iznova dogodilo i pri analizi narukvice dvoslivnog presjeka.

<sup>662</sup> Glogović 1988a: 15; Glogović 1989: 46; Glogović 2003: 47-48.



ponovno "reanimira" grobna cjelina koja sastavom odaje tipičnu nošnju sjeveroistočnog dijela kvarnerskog kruga. Kronološki, i naravno kulturološki, zmijasta dvodijelna fibula činila je neku drugu samostalnu cjelinu, upravo kao i ona fibula iz Klačenice, dok je fibula sa spiralno namotanim lukom zapravo iskopana na Garici, kako je već rečeno, i, dakako, nije imala veze s tzv. grizanskom grobnom cjelinom.

U svakoj prilici zmijastu dvodijelnu fibulu iz Grižana (kao i lučnu fibulu sa spiralno namotanim lukom iz Garice) treba datirati u usporedbi s HaB2/B3, odnosno BF3 od 10. i u 9. stoljeće korigirane periodizacije, i doista je vidjeti kao element novoga doba, kojeg navješćuju i ostali predmeti nošnje ili osobne opreme importirani iz formiranih apeninskih kultura PF1 horizonta. Napokon, u tome smislu treba razumijevati i pojavu naočalastih fibula tipa Haslau Regelsbrunn koje bi, kronološki i kulturološki, isto tako mogle obilježavati iskon starijeg željeznog doba na širem području Kvarnera.

Svoje kronološko mjesto u tom kulturno-povijesnom horizontu treba dati i predmetima koji ističu izrazito muško počelo: veće polukalotasto dugme (kat. 167),<sup>663</sup> ulomci jednorezne polumjesečaste britve (kat. 168) te ulomak vrška sječiva ojačanog rebrom (kat. 169), koji svi potječu iz garičke nekropole paljevinskog načina pokopavanja. Kod potonjeg je riječ o ulomku srpa izrađenog u jednodijelnom kalupu, dugotrajne korištenosti. Riječ je o prvom srpu poznatog s prostora Kvarnera i to priloženog u grobove, što je zapravo znano i iz groba 155 nekropole Brežec (sl. 61). Taj je običaj, međutim, svojstven srednjoeuropskom kompleksu KPŽ, povezan ne nužno uz muške, već i uz ženske, ali u pravilu visoko rangirane grobove posebne (astralne) simbolike.<sup>664</sup> Unatoč svemu, s obzirom na priličnu fragmentiranost, činjenica jest da garički srp ostaje tipološki i kronološki neopredjeljiv.<sup>665</sup>

Naprotiv, polumjesečasta britva, tj. ulomak tordirane ručke sa dva roščića na nastavku često se u stručnoj literaturi obrađivala i reproducirala.<sup>666</sup> Međutim, uvijek bez dijela sječiva na kome je, s obje strane, urezan ukras koncentričnih kružnica s točkom u sredini (kat. 168). Sukladno njihovoj tipološkoj klasifikaciji, ulomci iz Garice mogli bi

Indeed, the fibulae with a leaf-like hammered bow are a relatively frequent find as compared to the ones with a massively cast bow. However, a concentration of the latter has been documented exactly on the Kvarner territory, and will most probably be slightly older in terms of chronology.

Finally, if the fibulae from the eastern Adriatic coast are observed with regard to the form of their pins, then a regional workshop circle around the Liburnian examples and the Kvarner examples may be clearly singled out (fig. 68). This is why Š. Batović observed the fibulae from Grižane and Garica within the same chronological and typological framework and, considering them to be slightly older, she dated them into the Late Bronze Age of Liburnia.<sup>656</sup>

Since the discovery circumstances of the Grižane fibula are disputable (cat. 175), it is in any case an interesting "example" in the studies concerning this problem. In fact, if the unity of the grave inventory has to be accepted, then it can only be done in the sense as described by Š. Ljubić<sup>657</sup>, and not as reported by Š. Batović.<sup>658</sup> The latter author included different types of fibulae into one whole, which demonstrated the extremely unusual attire of the Kvarner territory, not only of a physical but also of a symbolic meaning, presenting a combination of autochthonous and foreign elements. According to that combination it turned out that large bow fibulae with two knobs on the bow and bracelets with double-pitch cross-section could have partly been contemporary with two-part serpentine fibulae, which could cover the period from the 11<sup>th</sup> to the 10<sup>th</sup> century, as somehow pointed out also by C. F. E. Pare (1998: 329).<sup>659</sup> This situation reminds of grave 272 on the necropolis of Brežec which was dated into the Late Bronze Age by the same author, exactly like the grave find from Grižane.<sup>660</sup> As already seen, the same had an impact also on the interpretation of central Bosnia finds.<sup>661</sup> However, if we are in doubt about the authenticity of the grave in *Batović's way*, which was in a certain way also the position of D. Glogović,<sup>662</sup> and consistently follow the publication by Ljubić and his description listing that the grave from Grižane near Tribalj included: "a bow fibula with two knobs on the bow, bracelets with an double-pitch cross-section and a pin with an onion-shaped head with a short part of the neck preserved", then a "reanimated" grave appears in front of us presenting the typical attire of the north-eastern part of Kvarner. At the same time, the two-part serpentine fibula, and the one from Klačenica, belong to a second, chronologically and culturally, independent find, whereas the fibula with a spirally rolled-up bow was actually discovered in Garica and had nothing to do with the so called *grave from Grižane*.

In any case, the two-part serpentine fibula from Grižane (with the bow fibula with a spirally rolled-up foot from Garica) should be dated in comparison with the HaB2/B3 period, or BF3 phase at the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> and the 9<sup>th</sup> century of the corrected periodization. It should be regarded as an element of the new period, which was announced also by the other elements of attire and of the personal equipment imported from the formed Apennine cultures of the PF1 horizon. Finally, also the appearance of spectacle fibulae of the Haslau-Regelsbrunn type should be considered in that sense as announcing, chronologically and typologically, the beginning of the Early Iron Age on the broader Kvarner area.

<sup>663</sup> Gotovo identična, samo bolje uščuvana polukalotasta dugmad potječe iz Novalje (kat. 43) i iz Rijeke bez pobližih podataka o nalaženju (kat. 146-147). No zajedno s ulomkom ukrašene falere iz Rijeke (kat. 148) mogu se okvirno odrediti istom vremenskom horizontu kasnog brončanog doba HaB stupnja.

<sup>664</sup> Turk 1994: 156; Hänsel 1997: 11-22; Gleirscher 2007: 31-32.

<sup>665</sup> Svi elementi nošnje i osobne opreme iz nekropole u Garici pokazuju izrazitu srodnost s građom iz inventara grobova Velike Gorice i Dobove. Međutim, vrlo sličan ulomak srpa potječe iz Mušje jame gdje je, vrlo općenito, kako zbog fragmentiranosti, tako i zbog kronološke neosjetljivosti, datiran u II. i III. horizont ostava (Turk 1994: 130-132, 155-156, T. 16: 10). Uvažimo li dataciju brežečkog groba 155 prema narukvicama, ili istovremenu modu naočalastih i fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, tada se čini razumnim i taj običaj vidjeti nešto starijeg datuma (HaA2/B1 horizont) na području sjevernoga Jadrana i obližnjeg mu zaleđa. U prilog toj tezi mogu poslužiti i skupni grobovi 3 i 5 (na tabli je pogrešno naveden broj groba 9!) iz starijih istraživanja špilje Bezdanjače u kojima su se nalazili također izrazito fragmentirani srpovi (Drechsler-Bižić 1980: 38, 43, 62, T. XIII: 5; XIV: 3; XXVI: 4; Kukoč 2009a: 21, Sl. 47). Sukladno ostalim nalazima možda nije pogrešno pretpostavljati njihovo povezivanje upravo uz ženske pokope unutar grobova datiranih na sam početak kasnog brončanog doba. Dataciju su potvrdile i provedene radiometričke analize drveta (Malinar 1998: 142). Novijim istraživanjima zabilježena su također još tri srpa, koja se tipološki i kronološki pripisuju već poznatima iz špilje (Malinar 1998: 143, T. V: 5-7). Svi srpovi su manje ili više oštećeni, upravo kao i svi srpovi koji potječu iz poznatih nam grobnih cjelina (Hansen 1994: 211).

<sup>666</sup> Starè 1957: T. III: 5; Batović 1980: VI: 11; Batović 1983: 312; Hiller 1991, Abb. 71D; Weber 1996: 256, T. 55: 618.

<sup>656</sup> Batović 1981: 94, 96; Batović 1983: 310.

<sup>657</sup> Ljubić 1876: Ljubić 1889: 72, T. 10: 36.

<sup>658</sup> Batović 1981: 94.


<sup>659</sup> Pare 1998: 329.

<sup>660</sup> Pare 1998: 327-328; usp. Della Casa 1996: 150.

<sup>661</sup> Gavranović 2011/I: 206, Abb. 199. The same happened again in the analyses of the bracelets with a double-pitch cross-section.

<sup>662</sup> Glogović 1988a: 15; Glogović 1989: 46; Glogović 2003: 47-48.





**Slika 76.** Karta distribucije polumjesečastih britvi tipa Oblekovice s ravnom drškom i trapezastim zaključkom karike (●) i tipa Fontanella s tordiranom ručkom i s roščićima na zaključku karike (■) (nadopunjeno prema Bianco Peroni 1979; Weber 1996) (Lista 17).

**Figure 76.** Distribution map of semilunate-shaped razors of Oblekovice type with a straight handle and trapezoidal ring at the end (●) and razors of Fontanella type with a twisted handle and horns on the ring at the end (■) (supplemented after Bianco Peroni 1979; Weber 1996) (List 17).

se zbog nesačuvanosti forme sječiva pripisati neodređenoj varijanti tipa Oblekovice prema C. Weberu,<sup>667</sup> odnosno tipu Fontanella ili tipu S. Vitale prema V. Bianco Peroni<sup>668</sup> vodećih upravo za navedeni stupanj i rasprostranjenih na širem području sjeverne Italije, sve do Alpa. Ukas koncentričnih kružnica na sječivu, tj. prema središnjoj grbi i izrazito naglašeni roščići kao nastavci na ručki, približavaju je ipak polumjesečastim britvama tipa Savena kakve su dobro poznate iz Bologne i Tarquinije, npr. Poggio dell'Impiccato grob 25 (sl. 75).<sup>669</sup> Ondje, zajedno s britvama tipa S. Vitale i sa zmijskim fibulama starije varijante, obilježavaju usklađeni Tarquinija, odnosno Bologna IA stupanj 10. stoljeća.<sup>670</sup> No navedena analogija, gdje je nađena i zmijska dvodijelna fibula s diskom na nozi mlađe razvojne faze, pokazuje kako se taj oblik britvi zadržao dugo u upotrebi - sve do početnog 9. stoljeća (Bologna IB). Budući da su one karakteristične za etrusko i bolognsko područje u svojim se varijantama pojavljuju i sve do područja Veneta,<sup>671</sup> zbog čega se britva tipa S. Vitale nalazi sa zmijskom dvodijelnom fibulom s rebrima i u grobu 74 nekropole Colombara.<sup>672</sup>

Najbliži nalaz garičkoj britvi također je ulomak tordirane ručkice s roščićima na okruglom nastavku iz Picuga(?).<sup>673</sup> S obzirom na stra-

Also several other finds should be mentioned within this cultural and historical horizon that have a typically male origin: a large semi-global button (cat. 167),<sup>663</sup> fragments of a semilunate razor (cat. 168) and the top of a blade with a reinforced rib (cat. 169), all coming from the necropolis of Garica. The latter find was most probably a fragment of a sickle used for a long period of time and produced by casting in a one-sided mold. It is the first known sickle from the Kvarner territory that was put into a grave, an action observed also in grave 155 in Brežec (fig. 61). However, this custom was typical of the central European Urnfield culture and is not necessarily linked to male, but also to female graves, which had as a rule a high ranking and a special (astral) symbolic value.<sup>664</sup> Due to its fragmentary character, the precise typological and chronological determination of the Garica sickle remains uncertain.<sup>665</sup>

<sup>663</sup> Almost identical, but better preserved, semi-global buttons were discovered in Novalja (cat. 43) and Rijeka (without any discovery information) (cat. 146-147). Together with a fragment of a decorated phalera (cat. 148) they could be dated into the same chronological horizon of the Late Bronze Age HaB phase.

<sup>664</sup> Turk 1994: 156; Hänsel 1997: 11-22; Gleirscher 2007: 31-32.

<sup>665</sup> All elements of attire and personal equipment from the necropolis in Garica show a distinctive similarity with the finds from the graves of Velika Gorica and Dobova. However, a similar fragment of a sickle comes from Mušja jama, where it was very generally dated into the II. or III. horizon of hoards (Turk 1994: 130-132, 155-156, T. 16: 10), due to its fragmented state as well as its chronological insensitivity. If we accept the dating of grave 155 from Brežec based on the bracelets or the simultaneous fashion of spectacle fibulae and fibulae with two knobs on the bow, then it seems reasonable to see this

<sup>667</sup> Weber 1996: T. 65A.

<sup>668</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: 58-60, T. 112B; T. 113A; usp. Weber 1996: 240.

<sup>669</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: 66-67, T. 97: D2; T. 113B.

<sup>670</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: 195-196, T. 27: 343; Dore 2005: 260.

<sup>671</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: 68-69, T. 113B.

<sup>672</sup> Salzani 2001: 90, Fig. 11B: 3-4.

<sup>673</sup> Mihovilić 2012: 423-424; Mihovilić 2013: 146, Sl. 84; Sl. 71.

žnji dio sječiva, može se također pribrojiti skupini britvi S. Vitale, zbog zaravnjenog i s ručkom paralelnog gornjeg dijela sječiva, što potencira i očuvani donji dio sječiva, okomito spušten od kratke tordirane ručkice. Još jedna slična ručkica, koja također potječe iz Picuga(?), znatno je izduženog tordiranog tijela, isto paralelnim s nastavkom sječiva, i užih, gotovo trapezasto spojenih roščića, pa se može najvjerojatnije pridružiti tipu Fontanella (sl. 76).<sup>674</sup>

Nadalje, u bližem okruženju i repertoar nalaza iz Škocjana, nekropole Ponikve grob Cq/217, sadržava također srodnu britvu,<sup>675</sup> koja je vremenski paralelizirana s najstarijim grobovima nekropole Brežec I.<sup>676</sup> S njom je uspoređen i drugi primjerak britve iz nekropole S. Barbare kod Elleri.<sup>677</sup> Pa iako, uz britve iz Garice i Picuga(?), predstavljaju jedine oblike takvih britvi na prostoru istočnog dijela sjevernoga Jadrana, one se i međusobno razlikuju. Britve iz Škocjana i S. Barbare ulaze naime u skupinu s trapezastim nastavkom glatke ručke, kakve su zapravo specifične za prostor karpatsko-podunavskog KPŽ i gdje su upravo imenovane tipom Oblekovice (sl. 76).<sup>678</sup> Suprotno, britve iz Garice i Picuga(?) pokazuju naime više srodnosti s navedenim italjskim primjercima. U svakom pogledu istarski ulomci polumjesečastih britvi, iako nedovoljno očuvani za detaljnije tipološke analize, jasno se međusobno razlikuju. Međutim, matično se područje i ovako za oba primjera nalazi u sjevernoj Italiji obilježavajući središnji transpadanski ili bolognski teritorij,<sup>679</sup> s pojedinim rasprostiranjima sve do švicarskih Alpa ili sjeverozapadne Hrvatske.<sup>680</sup> U takvim odnosima valja razumijevati nalaze iz Picuga(?) i iz Garice te najvjerojatnije britvu iz Velike Gorice,<sup>681</sup> drugim riječima tretirati ih kao importe iz kultura navedenih italjskih područja.<sup>682</sup>

Argumentaciji još snažnije uporište pruža raspored nalaza iz bogate ostave Limone,<sup>683</sup> jer se ondje nalazi još ponešto zanimljivih predmeta i za naše područje. U smislu široko prihvaćenog trenda tordiranja različitih ručki, valja izdvojiti i pincetu tipa Fontanella<sup>684</sup> kakvu također, u jednoj od varijanti, poznajemo iz Nezakcija, grob V-27,<sup>685</sup> i iz groba 1 nekropole Zagreb-Vrapče.<sup>686</sup> Naime, italjski su primjerci, s obzirom na kontekste grobova i ostava, smješteni u BF3, tj. HaB1 stupanj, po čemu su nešto mlađi od sjevernijih alpskih primjeraka gdje im se i tražilo izvorno područje iz okruženja HaA konteksta.<sup>687</sup> Grob iz zagrebačkog Vrapča nesumnjivo predstavlja stariju okolnost nalaženja navedene pincete i, s obzirom na britvu tipa Morzg, smješten je u vrijeme II. faze KPŽ sjeverne Hrvatske, tumačen uz utjecaje iz središnjeg alpskog, tirolskog prostora starije faze KPŽ.<sup>688</sup> Isto tako, već je mnogostruko ista-

On the other side, the semilunate razor – or actually the fragment of a twisted handle with two small horns on the ring at the end, was often analyzed and reproduced in the scientific literature.<sup>666</sup> However, it was always reproduced without the part of the blade which has an incised ornament on both sides and consists of circles with a point in the center (cat. 168). According to the typological classification of such razors and due to the unpreserved form of the blade, the Garica fragments could be generally attributed to an undefined variant of the Oblekovice type – according to C. Weber,<sup>667</sup> i.e. to the Fontanella or S. Vitale type – according to V. Bianco Peroni<sup>668</sup>, which are exactly typical of this period on the broader territory of northern Italy and all the way to the Alps. The decoration of concentric circles on the blade, i.e. towards the central hump, and two clearly accentuated small horns as handle rings, is more similar to the semilunate razors of the Savena type, which are well known from Bologna and Tarquinia, as for instance from the Poggio dell'Impiccato grave 25 (fig. 75).<sup>669</sup> There, together with razors of the S. Vitale type and serpentine fibulae of the older variant, they mark the harmonised Tarquinia or, better, Bologna IA phase of the 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>670</sup> The listed analogy, where also a serpentine two-part fibulae with a disc on the foot of the younger variant was discovered, demonstrate that this form remained in use all the way to the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century (Bologna IB). Since they were typical of the Etrurian and Bolognian territory, they appear in all of their forms also all the way up to the Veneto area,<sup>671</sup> which is why a razor of the S. Vitale type was discovered together with a two-part serpentine fibula with ribs in grave 74 of the Colombara necropolis.<sup>672</sup>

The closest find to the razor from Garica is a fragment of a handle with horns on a circular ending from Picugi(?).<sup>673</sup> With respect to the back side of the blade, it could also be attributed to the group of S. Vitale razors, because of the straightened upper part of the blade positioned parallel to the handle, which accentuates the preserved lower part of the blade, vertically lowered to reach the short twisted handle. Another similar handle, also from Picugi(?) has a prolonged twisted body, also parallel to the blade and with narrower, trapezoidal fused horns which make an attribution to the Fontanella type most probable (fig. 76).<sup>674</sup>

Furthermore, in the neighboring area, in the repertory of finds from Škocjan, on the necropolis Ponikve in grave Cq/217, a similar razor was

<sup>674</sup> Neobjavljen primjerak. Bio je izložen na izložbi AMI Puli *Histri u Istri*, Pula 2013.

<sup>675</sup> Guštin 1975: 463; Righi 1982: 12, T. VI: Cq/217: 2; Batović 1983: 312.

<sup>676</sup> Turk 1994: 165.

<sup>677</sup> Montagnari Kokelj 1997: 146, 150, T. 23: 16: 3.

<sup>678</sup> Weber 1996: T. 65A.

<sup>679</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: T. 113A; Peroni et al. 1980: 65, T. XXXV, 30; Weber 1996: 240.

<sup>680</sup> Weber 1996: T. 65A.

<sup>681</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1983: 578, T. LXXXVII: 2; Hiller 1991: 230; Karavanić 2009: Pl. 61: 8.

<sup>682</sup> Usp. drugačije kod K. Mihovilić, koja u njima prepoznaje značajne markere u obilježavanju prodora kretanja kontinentalne KPŽ sjeverozapadne Hrvatske, preko Istre, u sjevernu Italiju (Mihovilić 2013: 146)!

<sup>683</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: T. 97A.

<sup>684</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: T. 97A: 11.

<sup>685</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 188, T. 44: 21; Mihovilić 2012: 423, Fig. 4. Riječ je o izuzetno fragmentiranom ulomku s minimalnim dijelom očuvane raskovane pločice hvataljke.

<sup>686</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1983: T. LXXXVII: 2; Mihelić 2011: 128-129.

<sup>687</sup> Peroni 1989: 93.

<sup>688</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 68-69; Weber 1996: 231, T. 49: 530.

custom as slightly older (HaA2/B1 horizon) on the territory of the northern Adriatic and its close hinterland. This thesis could be supported by the mass graves number 3 and 5 (on the Table the number is falsely written 9!) from the old research in the Bezdanjača cave, where fragmented sickles were also discovered (Drechsler-Bižić 1980: 38, 43, 62, T. XIII: 5; XIV: 3; XXVI: 4; Kukoč 2009a: 21, Sl. 47). Taking into consideration also the other finds, it is possible to assume that they could have been linked to the female burials dated in to the beginning of Late Bronze Age. The relative dating was confirmed by the radiocarbon dating of wood (Malinar 1998: 142). During the latest research, three further sickles were discovered which are typologically and chronologically identical to known examples from the cave (Malinar 1998: 143, T. V: 5-7). All sickles were damaged to various degrees, exactly like all the sickles from the grave ensemble (Hansen 1994: 211).

<sup>666</sup> Staré 1957b: T. III: 5; Batović 1980: VI: 11; Batović 1983: 312; Hiller 1991, Abb. 71D; Weber 1996: 256, T. 55: 618.

<sup>667</sup> Weber 1996: T. 65A.

<sup>668</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: 58-60, T. 112B; T. 113A; comp. Weber 1996: 240.

<sup>669</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: 66-67, T. 97: D2; T. 113B.


<sup>670</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: 195-196, T. 27: 343; Dore 2005: 260.

<sup>671</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: 68-69, T. 113B.

<sup>672</sup> Salzani 2001: 90, Fig. 11B: 3-4.

<sup>673</sup> Mihovilić 2012: 423-424; Mihovilić 2013: 146, Sl. 84; Sl. 71.

<sup>674</sup> Unpublished. Exhibited on the exhibition of AMI *The Histri in Istria*, Pula 2013.



**Slika 77.** Rab-Gromačica, grob 7.

**Figure 77.** Rab-Gromačica, grave 7.

knuto kako, naime, pinceta iz ostave Limone predstavlja mlađi nalaz usporedan sa zmijastim jednodijelnim fibulama, što je također potvrđeno i nalazima iz Coste del Marano,<sup>689</sup> iz padanskog i iz područja protogolasseca kultura,<sup>690</sup> te s određenom dozom sigurnosti može biti aktualno i za asocijaciju nalaza iz groba V-27 nezakcijske nekropole datiranog u početnu fazu la-b žarne nekropole u Nezakciju.<sup>691</sup>

U tome kontekstu izdvaja se još jedan lijepi primjerak pincete, i to iz starih nalaza s otoka Krka (kat. 19, sl. 21). U cijelosti ima očuvanu izduženu tordiranu žicu, polukružno oblikovanu hvataljku ukrašenu s reljefno iskucanim kružnicama. Naravno, izravne paralele mogu se najbliže vidjeti kod nalaza iz frattesinskih nekropola, npr. Narde, grob 221,<sup>692</sup> gdje se našla oviješena o malu lučnu fibulu izrazito spiralno namotanog središnjeg dijela luka, inače predstavnikom posljednje faze BF3 protovillanovskih, izražajno srednjotirenskih kultura.<sup>693</sup> Nešto bliže, vrlo srodan primjerak poznat je iz Concordie Sagittarie, istražen u sloju datiranom u 10. stoljeće.<sup>694</sup> Izvjesno je, da se krčka i nezakcijska pinceta razlikuju, kako oblikovno tako i kronološki, pa bi, s obzirom na stilske značajke, krčku pincetu valjalo približiti italiskim primjercima 10. stoljeća<sup>695</sup> izrazito ženskog atributa, ali sinkronim s nalazima britvi tordirane ručnice, bilo tipa S. Vitale, bilo

<sup>689</sup> Bietti Sestieri 1973: 71.

<sup>690</sup> Negroni Catacchio et al. 1979: 82, kat. 80.

<sup>691</sup> Mihovilić 2001: 52-53.

<sup>692</sup> Salzani 1991: 126, Fig. 4: 3; Pare 1998: Abb. 8: 26.

<sup>693</sup> Peroni et al. 1980: 74-75; Carancini, Peroni 1999: 64, T. 31: 47.

<sup>694</sup> Bianchin Citton 1996: 264, 267, Fig. 50: 218.

<sup>695</sup> Za dataciju usp. Pare 1998: 313-314. Bez tipološke djeljivosti C. F. E. Pare sve pincete s tordiranom žicom uspoređuje s HaA2/B1 horizontom.

Gromačica: Grob Grave nr.	Mač Sword	Igla Pin	Fibula Fibula
7	X	X	
2		X	
5		X	
9		X	
6			2

**Slika 78.** Raspored i zastupljenost priloga u grobovima na Gromačici.

**Figure 78.** Arrangement and relations of grave goods of the excavated tumulus in Gromačica.

discovered.<sup>675</sup> The grave was chronologically equated to the oldest graves on the necropolis of Brežec I.<sup>676</sup> The same was true also of the finds from the necropolis of S. Barbara in Elleri.<sup>677</sup> Although they represent the only items of that kind on the territory of the northern Adriatic, along with the finds from Garica and Picugi(?), they present also certain differences. The razors from Škočjan and S. Barbara should be included into the group with the trapezoid extension of the handles, which are actually typical of the territory of the Carpato-Danubian Urnfield culture, where they were exactly denominated as the Obleskovic type (fig. 76),<sup>678</sup> whereas razors from Garica and Picugi(?) demonstrate even more similarities to the described Italic examples. Although insufficiently preserved for enabling a more detailed typological analysis, the Istrian fragments of semilunate razors present from all aspects clear differences among themselves. The place of origin of both examples is located in northern Italy characterizing the central Transpadanian or Bologna territory<sup>679</sup> with individual finds distributed up to the Swiss Alps and north-western Croatia.<sup>680</sup> We should observe the finds from Picugi(?), Garica and most probably also from Velika Gorica<sup>681</sup> in the same relations – they should be considered as imports from cultures of the stated territory.<sup>682</sup>

Even a stronger point for our argumentation comes from finds of the rich Limone hoard<sup>683</sup> containing few items that are of interest also for our area. In a broadly accepted trend of twisting different handles, we have to point out the tweezers of the Fontanella type,<sup>684</sup> which is known in one of its variants from grave V-27 from Nesactium<sup>685</sup> and grave 1 from Zagreb-Vrapče.<sup>686</sup> In fact, with regard to the contexts of graves and hoards, Italic exemplars are dated to BF3, which corresponds to HaB1, and are thus younger than the examples located north of them in the Alpine area, where their origins were searched within the HaA context.<sup>687</sup> The Zagreb-Vrapče grave undoubtedly

<sup>675</sup> Guštin 1975: 463; Righi 1982: 12, T. VI: Cq/217: 2; Batović 1983: 312.

<sup>676</sup> Turk 1994: 165.

<sup>677</sup> Montagnari Kokelj 1997: 146, 150, T. 23: 16: 3.

<sup>678</sup> Weber 1996: T. 65A.

<sup>679</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: T. 113A; Peroni et al. 1980: 65, T. XXXV, 30; Weber 1996: 240.

<sup>680</sup> Weber 1996: T. 65A.

<sup>681</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1983: 578, T. LXXXVII: 2; Hiller 1991: 230; Karavanić 2009: Pl. 61: 8.

<sup>682</sup> Compare a different opinion by K. Mihovilić who recognizes in them specific markers characterizing the spread of continental Urnfield culture from north-western Croatia across Istria to northern Italy (Mihovilić 2013: 146)!

<sup>683</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: T. 97A.

<sup>684</sup> Bianco Peroni 1979: T. 97A: 11.

<sup>685</sup> Mihovilić 2001a: 188, T. 44: 21; Mihovilić 2012: 423, Fig. 4. It is extremely fragmented piece with a minimal part of the preserved thin handle plate.

<sup>686</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1983: T. LXXXVII: 2; Mihelić 2011: 128-129.

<sup>687</sup> Peroni 1989: 93.

tipa Savena, odnosno vidjeti ih u istim onim društvenim razmjerima transjadranskih relacija "novog vala" na prijelazu milenija.

Početak villanovskog stupnja IA, odnosno PF1A,<sup>696</sup> kako smo vidjeli, u tipološko-kronološkom smislu izuzev fibula u muškoj i ženskoj nošnji, prominentan oblik muških grobova obilježavaju i polumjesečaste britve tipa S. Vitale ili tipa Savena ili tipa Tarquinija. Još će više tu poziciju odražavati pojava igala s vazasto ili diskasto oblikovanom glavicom. Općenito, prateći njihovu pojavu te igle predstavljaju oblik dugog trajanja, sve čak do Bologna IIA stupnja, a u mnoštvu varijanti suptilnih razlika, koje im omogućuju tipološko-kronološku hijerarhiju, rasplinjava se zapravo njihova velika nejednakost i nehomogenost.<sup>697</sup> Zbog tih osobitosti, kao i datibilnih konteksta nalaženja, obilježavaju ključni moment rasprava oko definiranja početka željeznog doba Italije (PF1) koje se, u relacijama minucioznije tipološke klasifikacije(?), uz radiometričke podatke te usporedbe (*cross-dating*) s dendrokronološkim datacijama zapadnoalpskih sojeničarskih nalazišta, sada uglavnom smješta oko sredine 10. stoljeća.<sup>698</sup>

Zbog činjenice da su te igle na širokom prostoru od Alpa do pad-ske nizine i bolognskog prostora izuzetno zastupljene, a prema tipologiji R. Peronija podijeljene u više grupa (VII) i vremenski zastupljene u kontinuitetu od oko 150 godina, u taj bi se široki vremenski raspon trebali uklopiti i primjerci koji potječu iz Kvarnera. Riječ je o samo dvije igle, od kojih igla iz Klačenice nema poznatih nalazišnih podataka (kat. 188),<sup>699</sup> dok je igla iz Gromačice bila dijelom cjeline groba 7 zajedno s brončanim tzv. kratkim mačem (kat. 152, sl. 78-79).<sup>700</sup> Obratimo im stoga veću pozornost.

D. Glogović zaključuje kako su igle s vazastom glavicom neuobičajen dio nošnje kako na prostoru Liburnije tako i na prostoru Istre te ih pripisuje utjecajima iz istočnoalpskog prostora 9. i 8. stoljeća, čiju dataciju prihvaća i K. Mihovilić. Međutim, najbliža paralela igli iz Klačenice s ravnim diskom i tri okrugla zadebljanja na vratu, koja se proporcionalno smanjuju prema igli, ipak se nalazi u samoj Bologni, pogotovo u nekropoli Savena, grob 292<sup>701</sup> ili u naselju Montagnana, Borgo S. Zeno,<sup>702</sup> i ne kod istočnoalpskih primjeraka. Igla iz Gromačice također ima najizravnije analogije u Bologni, npr. S. Vitale, grob 718, pa čak i u Veio, Quattro Fontanili, grob X7,<sup>703</sup> a sličnosti s iglama vazasto oblikovane glavice iz picenske Ancone i P. Sant' Elpidio već su više puta istaknute.<sup>704</sup>

Kvarnerske igle pripadaju grupama IV i V s naglašenom i zaobljenom kuglicom na vratu i ravnim diskom koje su obilježje čitave I.

<sup>696</sup> Pacciarelli 2005: 84-85, T. A.

<sup>697</sup> Trachsel 2004: 226, Abb. 133-134; Peroni, Vanzetti 2005: 54-55, T. 3-4; Dore 2005: 260-261, T. 2.

<sup>698</sup> Peroni, Vanzetti 2005: 64; Pacciarelli 2005: 84-85, T. 86. O problemima kronologije početka željeznoga doba vidjeti rasprave sa znanstvenog skupa *Oriente e Occidente, Mediterranea I*. Pisa-Roma 2005.

<sup>699</sup> Brunšmid 1901: T. 1: 1b; Glogović 1989: 10-11, T. 6: 4.

<sup>700</sup> Matejčić 1968: 75, T. VIII: 3; Glogović 1989: 11, T. 6: 5; Mihovilić 2001b: 174-175, T. 2: 5.

<sup>701</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 58: M1.

<sup>702</sup> Bianchin Citton 1998: 284, Fig. 159: 17.

<sup>703</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 59: B1; Carancini 1975: kat. 275-260: 1902, 1906, 1913, 1918, 1946...; Harding 1995: 17, f.n. 44; Trachsel 2004: 226, Abb. 134. Apolutno neodgovarajuće analogije za iglu iz Gromačice ponudio je A. Harding što se zapadnobalkanskog prostora tiče. To pogotovo vrijedi za usporedbu s iglom tipa Sirolo Numana iz Jezerina (Marić 1968: T. 1. 31) ili za iglu iz Gajine pećine s velikom pločastom glavicom, bikoničnim zadebljanjem na vratu i kosim urezima po vratu (Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 165, T. 128: 13; Drechsler-Bižić 1987: 400, Sl. 22: 18; Bakarić 2004b: 357, kat. 1.2), koja sasvim odgovara igli iz Ostrošca (Raunig 1982: T. I: 1, Karta), i koja je vremenski dobro određena prisustvom fibule tipa Golinjevo treće generacije (Drechsler-Bižić 1987: 400, Sl. 22: 9).

<sup>704</sup> Blečić 2007a: 112-113.

presents the oldest context of discovery of the tweezers due to the presence of a razor of the Morzg type, dated into the II<sup>nd</sup> phase of the Urnfield culture in northern Croatia, and interpreted as reflecting the influences from the central Alpine area of Tirol.<sup>688</sup> In the same way, as has already been pointed out many times, the tweezers from the Limone hoard are a younger find concurrent with serpentine one-part fibulae, which was also confirmed by the finds from Costa del Marano,<sup>689</sup> Padania and from the Protogolasseca culture,<sup>690</sup> and which can be used with a certain degree of certainty also for associating the finds in grave V-27 from Nesactium dated into the initial la-b phase of the Nesactium cremation grave necropolis.<sup>691</sup>

Another well preserved example of tweezers coming from old excavations on the island of Krk must be discussed within this context (cat. 19, fig. 21). Its elongated twisted wire is entirely preserved and its semicircular grasp is decorated with embossed circles. Direct comparisons could be observed in the finds from the Frattesina necropoles, for instance in grave 221 from Narde,<sup>692</sup> where it was hung upon a small bow fibula with a markedly twisted central part of the bow – typical of the last phase of BF3 Protovillanovan Middle-Tyrrhenian cultures.<sup>693</sup> A bit closer, a very similar example is known from Concordia Saggittaria, discovered in a layer dated to the 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>694</sup> It is clear that the tweezers from Krk and that of Nesactium differ both in terms of shape and chronology, so that the Krk example should be put closer to the Italic finds of the 10<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>695</sup> discovered in female graves and synchronous with razors with twisted handles of the S. Vitale or Savena types, and should observe them within the same social context of trans-Adriatic relations of the "new wave" at the turn of the millennium.

Except for the fibulae in male and female attire, from the typological and chronological perspective, the beginning of the Villanovan IA phase, i.e. of the PF1A phase<sup>696</sup> is marked by semilunate razors of the S. Vitale, Savena or Tarquinia types present in male graves of a prominent shape. This position will be reflected even more in the appearance of pins with a vase-shaped head representing a long lasting form, reaching the Bologna IIA phase. In a multitude of forms with subtle differences, which enable the creation of a typological and chronological hierarchy, their non-homogeneity and inequality will be dissolved.<sup>697</sup> Due to these characteristics and the datable contexts of discovery, they mark a key moment in the discussions concerning the definition of the beginning of the Iron Age in Italy (PF1). Today, the latter is mainly dated around the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century<sup>698</sup>, within the relations of detailed typological classification (?), alongwith radiocarbon dating and comparisons (*cross-dating*) with the dendrochronological dating of Western Alps pile dwellings.

Due to the fact that these pins are widely present in large amounts on the area stretching from the Alps to the Padanian Plain and the terri-

<sup>688</sup> Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 68-69; Weber 1996: 231, T. 49: 530.

<sup>689</sup> Bietti Sestieri 1973: 71.

<sup>690</sup> Negroni Catacchio et al. 1979: 82, cat. 80.

<sup>691</sup> Mihovilić 2001: 52-53.

<sup>692</sup> Salzani 1991: 126, Fig. 4: 3; Pare 1998: Abb. 8: 26.

<sup>693</sup> Peroni et al. 1980: 74-75; Carancini, Peroni 1999: 64, T. 31: 47.


<sup>694</sup> Bianchin Citton 1996: 264, 267, Fig. 50: 218.

<sup>695</sup> For dating compare Pare 1998: 313-314. Without further typological subdivision C. F. E. Pare dates all the tweezers with twisted wire in to HaA2/B1 horizon.

<sup>696</sup> Pacciarelli 2005: 84-85, T. A.

<sup>697</sup> Trachsel 2004: 226, Abb. 133-134; Peroni, Vanzetti 2005: 54-55, T. 3-4; Dore 2005: 260-261, T. 2.

<sup>698</sup> Peroni, Vanzetti 2005: 64; Pacciarelli 2005: 84-85, T. 86. Regarding problems of the beginning of Iron Age see the publication of the conference *Oriente e Occidente, Mediterranea I*, Pisa-Roma 2005.



**Slika 79.** Inventar groba 136 iz nekropole Brežec (nadopunjeno prema Mizzan 1994).

**Figure 79.** Inventory of grave 136 from the necropolis of Brežec (supplemented after Mizzan 1994).

faze Bologne i njezinog mlađeg B stupnja prema R. Peroniju.<sup>705</sup> Njihova je datacija u apsolutnom smislu određena shodno nalazištima Auvèrner Nord, kao i u Hauterive-Champréveyres gdje im je pojava, razvoj i trajanje paralelna s tzv. *Bomben* iglama (od HaB1-B2 do HaB3) koje, kao i u Morano sul Po, obilježavaju početak Villanova IA stupnja, tj. Golasecca IA (oko 950./925. godine).<sup>706</sup> Igle iz Klačenice i Gromačice treba stoga vidjeti kao importe iz Italije, što potvrđuju i ostali nalazi s tih nekropola, u datacijskom kontekstu HaB i vjerojatno njegovog drugog stupnja.

Nadalje, zaštitnim istraživanjem nekropole Gromačice najvećim su brojem, u 4 grobne cjeline, zastupljene igle (sl. 78). Međutim, izuzetna, i u ovome razmatranju vrijedna je samo grobna cjelina 7, jer se uz iglu nalazio i tzv. kratki mač s ukrasnim okovom korica mača (kat. 153-154, sl. 77-78).<sup>707</sup> Preostali dio mača, tj. sječivo i ploča za nasad rukohvata prilično su loše ušćuvani, što je pogodovalo vrlo raznolikoj diskusiji ili različitom, još uvijek ne konačnom, tipološkom opredjeljenju. A. Harding navedeni mač svrstava tako u istu grupu kratkih mačeva, kao i mač iz Nezakcija,<sup>708</sup> što je demantirala K. Mihovilić oblikovnim i razlikama u dimenzijama. Ona ga je pak usporedila sa starijim bodežima iz ranodinastijskog

tory of Bologna, and divided, based on R. Peroni's typology, into several groups (VII), and continuously present for some 150 years, they create a timeframe into which also the Kvarner examples should be included. These are two pins, from which the Klačenica example has no data about its discovery (cat. 188),<sup>699</sup> whereas the Gromačica pin comes from grave 7, where it was discovered together with a bronze, so-called short sword (cat. 152, fig. 78-79).<sup>700</sup> Let us thus focus on them.

D. Glogović concluded that the pins with a vase-shaped head were an unusual element of attire on the territory of Liburnia and Istria, and ascribed them to the influences from the eastern Alpine area and dated them into the 9<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> centuries, which was later adopted also by K. Mihovilić. However, the closest comparison to the pin from Klačenica with a straight disc and three round thickenings on the neck, which are proportionally reduced in size towards the pin, could not be observed in the east Alpine examples, but in finds from Bologna itself, especially in the necropolis Savena, in grave 292,<sup>701</sup> or in the Montagnana settlement, in Borgo S. Zeno.<sup>702</sup> The pin from Gromačica also displays the most direct analogies in Bologna – for example S. Vitale, grave 718, and even in Veio, Quattro Fontanili, grave X7.<sup>703</sup> The similarities with the pins with a vase-shaped head from Picenian Ancona and Porto Sant' Elpidio have already been pointed out many times.<sup>704</sup>

Kvarner pins should be included into groups IV and V with an accentuated and rounded globule on the neck and a flat disc – since they are the main characteristic of the entire 1<sup>st</sup> phase of Bologna and its younger B phase, according to R. Peroni.<sup>705</sup> Their absolute dating was determined according to the sites such as Auvèrner Nord and Hauterive-Champréveyres where their appearance, development and use were concurrent with the so called "*Bomben*" pins (from HaB1-B2 to HaB3), which determine, as in Morano sul Po, the beginning of the Villanova IA phase, i.e. Golasecca IA (around 950/925 BC).<sup>706</sup> The pins from Klačenica and Gromačica should be considered as direct imports from Italy, as confirmed by other finds from these necropoles dated into HaB and probably its second phase.

Pins proved to be the most numerous finds in four graves in the rescue excavations on the necropolis of Gromačica (fig. 78). However, only grave 7 is important for our discussion since together with the pin also a so called short sword with a decorated metal plating of the sheath was discovered (cat. 153-154, fig. 77-78).<sup>707</sup> Since the rest of the sword, i.e. its blade and handle, are quite poorly preserved, it trig-

<sup>699</sup> Brunšmid 1901: T. 1: 1b; Glogović 1989: 10-11, T. 6: 4.

<sup>700</sup> Matejčić 1968: 75, T. VIII: 3; Glogović 1989: 11, T. 6: 5; Mihovilić 2001b: 174-175, T. 2: 5.

<sup>701</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 58: M1.

<sup>702</sup> Bianchin Citton 1998: 284, Fig. 159: 17.

<sup>703</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 59: B1; Carancini 1975: cat. 275-260: 1902, 1906, 1913, 1918, 1946...; Harding 1995: 17, f.n. 44; Trachsel 2004: 226, Abb. 134. Completely erroneous comparisons from the western Balkan area with the pin from Gromačica were presented by A. Harding. This is most of all true of the comparison with the pin of the Sirolo Numana type from Jezerine (Marić 1968: T. 1. 31) or the pin from Gajina pećina with a large flat head, a byconical thickening on the neck and oblique incisions on the neck (Vinski-Gasparini 1973: 165, T. 128: 13; Drechsler-Bižić 1987: 400, Sl. 22: 18; Bakarić 2004b: 357, cat. 1.2). The latter is similar to the pin from Ostrožac (Raunig 1982: T. I: 1, Karta), which is chronologically well dated due to the presence of a Golinjevo type fibula of the third generation (Drechsler-Bižić 1987: 400, Sl. 22: 9).

<sup>704</sup> Blečić 2007a: 112-113.

<sup>705</sup> Peroni, Vanzetti 2005: T. 3-4.

<sup>706</sup> Trachsel 2004: 264-265, Abb. 162; Pacciarelli 2005: T. A.

<sup>705</sup> Peroni, Vanzetti 2005: T. 3-4.

<sup>706</sup> Trachsel 2004: 264-265, Abb. 162; Pacciarelli 2005: T. A.

<sup>707</sup> Matejčić 1968: 78-79, 82-83, T. VII; VIII; Glogović 1989: 15, T. 11: 5; Harding 1995: 17, T. 2: 15; Mihovilić 2001b: 174-175, T. 2: 5-7. Sasvim ga neispravno G. Hiller ubraja u mačeve jezičastog rukohvata (Hiller 1991: 262-265, 417, Abb. 79).

<sup>708</sup> Harding 1995: 17.

<sup>707</sup> Matejčić 1968: 78-79, 82-83, T. VII; VIII; Glogović 1989: 15, T. 11: 5; Harding 1995: 17, T. 2: 15; Mihovilić 2001b: 174-175, T. 2: 5-7. Completely erroneous G. Hiller includes it among the sword with a tanged hilt (Hiller 1991: 262-265, 417, Abb. 79).

Ura IIIa, odnosno rapirima iz Thapsosa s jedne, te s druge strane s kratkim italskim mačem iz groba 94 nekropole Terni!<sup>709</sup> Potonji je kratki mač, tipa Terni, datiran zajedno s polumjesečastom britvom tipa Tarquinija (ili možda Fermo) prema mišljenju V. Bianco Peroni u II.B fazu Terni.<sup>710</sup> Britve su, kako je već istaknuto, indikativan nalaz muških grobova srednoitalskog prostora, Etrurije pa i Bologne ranog villanovskoga horizonta (I),<sup>711</sup> a često se nalaze i sa zmijastim dvodijelnim fibulama kao što je to slučaj opet u Terni, u grobu 148 (sl. 74).<sup>712</sup> S obzirom na nalaz igle s vazastom glavicom u istome grobu Gromačice u navedenom je vremenskom odnosu približno datiran i naš mač, dakle u 9. i 8. stoljeće.<sup>713</sup>

Mač po svom obliku sječiva (kat. 153), istanjenog rombičnog presjeka iako jasno istaknutog središnjeg rebra, kao i paralelno urezanim po tri/četiri linije uz rubove oštrica, koje se sijeku pri samom kraju sječiva, tj. na vrhu oštrice, formalno ne, ali ga sadržajno ipak ponešto udaljuju od navedenih italskih paralela. Ploča za nasad trokutastog je oblika sa tri rupice i sačuvanom jednom zakovicom. Pri samom vrhu, koji je odlomljen, završava četvrtastom šire izvedenom jezičastom istakom, s asimetrično postavljenom rupicom, koja je mogla biti jedino namijenjena ili je bila dijelom punog rukohvata dodatno obloženim brončanim ili nekim neodrživim organskim materijalom.<sup>714</sup> Sve iznesene karakteristike mača izravno upućuju na mačeve punog kovinskog rukohvata poznatih iz nekropole Brežec (posebno grobovi 136 i 165), na što je već ukazao Š. Batović smatrajući ih, isključivo, balkanskim proizvodom 8. stoljeća!<sup>715</sup> Daljnji argument toj usporedbi pruža i sačuvan ukrasni okov korica mača iz istoga groba (kat. 154). Naime, konične forme i elipsoidnog presjeka tijela, kuglasto profiliranog zadebljanja, okruglog presjeka istake i zaključak, tj. baza u obliku pločice, gotovo identičan je onome iz spomenutog groba 136 brežečke nekropole (sl. 79).<sup>716</sup> Na usporedbu je ukazao i A. Harding i naš je primjerak, smatrajući ga nešto mlađim od brežečkog, definirao kao tip Gromačica.<sup>717</sup> I ukras paralelno urezanih linija raspoznatljiv je na oba okova, dok su četiri istake na središnjem kuglastom zadebljanju ipak specifičnost samo okova iz Gromačice, iako na maču iz groba 165 u Brežcu postoje otvori za organskih pet istaka upravo na kuglastom zadebljanju, inače urezanim paralelnim linijama ukrašenom rukohvatu.<sup>718</sup> Slijedom rasprave, neizbježno valja istaknuti da je već kod mačeva tipa Škocjan-Kulen Vakuf, tj. kod analize mačeva punih kovinskih rukohvata s okruglom glavom, pokazano kako sječivo može biti pričvršćeno za rukohvat sa samo jednom zakovicom, što je upravo slučaj kod mača iz Kulen

gered a varied discussion and a varied, still not final typological determination of the sword. While A. Harding included it into a group of short swords together with the find from Nesactium,<sup>708</sup> K. Mihovilić rejected it due to the sword's different form and size. She compared it to the older daggers from Ur IIIa or rapiers from Thapsos on one side, and with the short Italian sword from grave 94 from the necropolis of Terni on the other side!<sup>709</sup> The latter short sword of the Terni type was dated together with a semilunate razor of the Tarquinia (or perhaps Fermo) type, according to V. Bianco Peroni's opinion, into the II.B phase of Terni.<sup>710</sup> Razors were, as already mentioned, a significant find from male graves of central Italy, of Etruria and Bologna of the early Villanova horizon (I),<sup>711</sup> and were often discovered with two-part serpentine fibulae, as shown in grave 148 from Terni (fig. 74).<sup>712</sup> Taking into consideration the pin with a vase-shaped head found in the grave from Gromačica, also the short sword was included into the same chronological period, i.e. in the 9<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>713</sup>

Due to the form of the sword's blade (cat. 153), which has a flattened rhomboid cross-section, with a clearly pronounced central rib, as well as three/four incised lines running parallel to the blade and crossing at the tip of the blade, slightly depart from the given Italic swords, although not formally, but conceptually. Its hilt plate for hafting of the handle is of a triangular form with three perforations and a single preserved rivet. The point of the blade, which is broken off, ends with a square tang and an asymmetrically positioned perforation, which must have been intended for hafting the handle, or it was additionally wrapped with bronze or another organic material.<sup>714</sup> All listed characteristics suggest analogies to the solid hilted swords from the necropolis of Brežec (especially graves 136 and 165) which was already demonstrated by Š. Batović, who considered them exclusively a Balkan product of the 8<sup>th</sup> century!<sup>715</sup> A further argument in favor of this interpretation is the decorative metal plating of the sheath from the same grave (cat. 154). Due to its conical form and ellipsoid cross-section of the body, circular thickening with a further protuberance of a circular cross-section and the end forming the base in the form of a plate, it is almost identical to the one from grave 136 from Brežec (fig. 79).<sup>716</sup> This parallel was already mentioned by A. Harding, who considered it to be slightly younger and defined it as the Gromačica type.<sup>717</sup> Also the decoration of parallel incised lines is recognizable on both metal sheath plating, while the four protuberances on the central circular part are typical only of Gromačica, although on the sword from grave 165 from Brežec there are open-

<sup>709</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: 244, T. 41B; Leonelli 2003: 137-138; usp. Mihovilić 2001b: 174.

<sup>710</sup> Bianco Peroni 1970: kat. 254; Bianco Peroni 1979: 76, T. 35: 431; T. 114B.

<sup>711</sup> Npr. Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 59; Dore 2005: 260-261, T. 2, 3.

<sup>712</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 41A; Bianco Peroni 1970: T. 80: A; Pacciarelli 2001: 250-251, 255, Fig. 136C; Leonelli 2003: 174-175.

<sup>713</sup> Mihovilić 2001b: 175.

<sup>714</sup> Naime, ako se usporede svi poznati crteži, s fotografijom koju je objavila R. Matejčić, posve je razvidno kako se svi oni i međusobno razlikuju. Napokon, A. Harding je "uljepšao" crtež mača preuzetog od D. Glogović koji je ionako bio najlošija reprodukcija. Građu nije dokumentirao prema izvorniku.

<sup>715</sup> Batović 1980: 36-37; usp. *contra* Vitri 1979: 84-85, T. I: 1.

<sup>716</sup> Vitri 1977: Fig. 15: 26, T. XII: T. 126; Vitri 1979: 84, T. I: 1, E-G; Mizzan 1994: 106-108, Fig. 1.

<sup>717</sup> Harding 1995: 105. Izuzetan okov korica mača D. Glogović nije reproducirala, a A. Harding ga je preuzeo iz izvorne fotografije R. Matejčić (Harding 1995: A30), zbog čega je crtež deformiran i nepotpun. Ujedno treba reći kako je crtež okova korica mača iz Brežeca nacrtan manji od okova iz Gromačice iako je u stvarnosti obrnuta situacija!

<sup>718</sup> Mizzan 1994: T. 2: 6.

<sup>708</sup> Harding 1995: 17.

<sup>709</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: 244, T. 41B; Leonelli 2003: 137-138; comp. Mihovilić 2001b: 174.

<sup>710</sup> Bianco Peroni 1970: kat. 254; Bianco Peroni 1979: 76, T. 35: 431; T. 114B.

<sup>711</sup> For example Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 59; Dore 2005: 260-261, T. 2; 3.

<sup>712</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 41A; Bianco Peroni 1970: T. 80: A; Pacciarelli 2001: 250-251, 255, Fig. 136C; Leonelli 2003: 174-175.

<sup>713</sup> Mihovilić 2001b: 175.

<sup>714</sup> If we compare all the present drawings with the photography published by R. Matejčić, we can see that they are different. Finally A. Harding "augmented" the illustration which he took from D. Glogović who published the worst reproduction at all.

<sup>715</sup> Batović 1980: 36-37; comp. *contra* Vitri 1979: 84-85, T. I: 1.

<sup>716</sup> Vitri 1977: Fig. 15: 26, T. XII: T. 126; Vitri 1979: 84, T. I: 1, E-G; Mizzan 1994: 106-108, Fig. 1.

<sup>717</sup> Harding 1995: 105. The exceptionally important metal plating of the scabbard was not reproduced by D. Glogović. A. Harding took it over from the original photo by R. Matejčić (Harding 1995: A30). Therefore, his illustration was deformed and incomplete. At the same time, we have to note that in the drawing, the metal sheath of the scabbard from Brežec appears to be smaller, than the Gromačica one (Harding 1995: T. 44: A3; T. 45: A30), although the situation is quite the opposite in reality.



**Slika 80.** Igle tipa Sirolo Numana iz 1: Osora (foto: M. Blečić Kavur), 2: Picugi, 3: Limske gradine, 4: Kaštelira kod Nove Vasi (prema Mihovilić 2013).

**Figure 80.** Pins of the Sirolo Numana type from 1: Osor (Photo: M. Blečić Kavur), 2: Picugi, 3: Limska gradina, 4: Kaštelir kod Nove Vasi (after Mihovilić 2013).

Vakufa<sup>719</sup> i što daje podršku tezi kako je i rukohvat mača iz Gromačice bio izrađen na, možda, sličan način.<sup>720</sup>

Čuveni grobovi s mačevima 136 i 165, predstavnici su muške vodeće škočjanske aristokracije i/ili klana koji svojim rasporedom označavaju središte brežečke nekropole i njezin II. stupanj pokopavanja prema P. Turku (sl. 79).<sup>721</sup> Datirani su time u 9. i 8. stoljeće, što je zapravo usklađeno s predloženom novom datacijom predmetnih mačeva koju je iznijela S. Vitri.<sup>722</sup> U njihovoj mogućoj interpretaciji već se S. Gabrovec odmaknuo od teze koju je zastupao Š. Batović i u tim je mačevima vidio izravne i jedino ispravne paralele s Italijom, što je podupirao i s ostalom poznatom građom iz te nekropole, npr. s dijelovima konjske opreme izrazito srodne italjskim primjercima.<sup>723</sup> U istome je pravcu i P. Turk izdvojio vrijednost navedenih grobova s mačevima, a s obzirom na potpunost bogate muške garniture ukazao je na paralele u nekropoli Terni posebno u grobu 148 (sl. 74),<sup>724</sup> koji je i inače izabran kao vodeći element PF1 stupnja elitnih muških grobova najvišeg društvenoga ranga srednjotalskog prostora.<sup>725</sup>

<sup>719</sup> Turk 1994: 124.

<sup>720</sup> O slaboj kvaliteti i mekoći bronce, tj. slaboj očuvanosti mača već je pisala R. Matejčić u izvornoj objavi građiva 1968. godine.

<sup>721</sup> Turk 1994: 158-160; Teržan 1990a: 71.

<sup>722</sup> Vitri 1983: 142-144. Mačeve je A. Harding ubrojio u antenske mačeve tipa Weltenburg smještene na prijelazu HaB3/C1 horizonta koji se sasvim očekivano uklapaju u rasprostiranje tog tipa mačeva na prostoru srednje Europe i Italije (Hrading 1995: 81-82, T. 33: 253). U vrijeme obrade i publiciranja građe iz bivše Jugoslavije autoru nisu bili poznati novi podatci, tj. objavljen inventar iz tih "izgubljenih" grobova u Gradskom muzeju u Trstu (Mizzan 1994). Polumjesečasta britva pripada neopozivo tipu Monterozzi smještenom u stupanj HaB2-B3 prema V. Bianco Peroni (1979: 116) (sl. 79: 5).

<sup>723</sup> Gabrovec 1983: 86, Sl. 9: 25; Gabrovec 1987b: 156, T. XVI: 10.

<sup>724</sup> Turk 1994: 159.

<sup>725</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 41A; Pacciarelli 2001: 250-251, 255, Fig. 136C.

ings for five protuberances on the circular thickening of the handle decorated with incised parallel lines.<sup>718</sup> In the present discussion the fact must be pointed out that the swords of the Škočjan-Kulen Vakuf type, i.e. swords with a solid handle with a round head, it was demonstrated that a blade could be hafted to the hilt by means of only one single rivet, as in the case of the sword from Kulen Vakuf,<sup>719</sup> which further supports the idea that the hilt of the sword from Gromačica was made in a similar way.<sup>720</sup>

The famous graves with swords 136 and 165 are representatives of the leading aristocracy from Škočjan or of the leading clan, which mark, based on their distribution, the central position of the Brežec necropolis and its II<sup>nd</sup> chronological phase, according to P. Turk (fig. 79).<sup>721</sup> Thereby, they were dated into the 9<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> centuries, which is in accordance with the suggested new chronology of these swords as proposed by S. Vitri.<sup>722</sup> In their possible interpretation already S. Gabrovec distanced himself from the thesis by Š. Batović, and saw direct and correct comparisons only with the swords from Italy, which he supported with other finds from the same necropolis, as for example with parts of horse harnesses extremely similar to the examples from Italy.<sup>723</sup> Following the same direction, P. Turk pointed out the importance of those graves with swords, and due to the completeness of male attire he indicated the comparisons with the necropolis of Terni, especially in grave 148 (fig. 74),<sup>724</sup> which was earlier selected as one of the leading elements of the PF1 phase in elite male graves of the highest rank of the central Italic territory.<sup>725</sup>

According to the data from the excavations of the tumulus in Gromačica, grave number 7 was located a bit outside the concentration of other graves, but since no further research was conducted, no precise analysis of spatial or structural classification of the graves is available. The equipment of the deceased, i.e. that of swordbarbers is standard, but at the same time also exceptional, both in the local and in the regional sense of that time. Based on the presented analogies and arguments, as well as according to the dating of the pin with a vase-shaped head, the sword with remains of the sheath, a unique find in the region of Kvarner, should be chronologically equated with PF1, i.e. with the I Villanovan horizon (HaB2-B3), which means with the beginning of 9<sup>th</sup> but also possibly with the end of 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>726</sup> Apart from indicating direct contacts with the Italic territory, this sword might suggest the already known method of adoption of artifacts as well as ideas and their transformation into a specific regional or individual *opus* as was the case with the swords from Brežec and Gromačica.

Under certain circumstances the Osor knife, presented only in the older literature, could be interpreted within the same chronological

<sup>718</sup> Mizzan 1994: T. 2: 6.

<sup>719</sup> Turk 1994: 124.

<sup>720</sup> Already R. Matejčić reported in her initial publication in 1968 that the bronze was very soft and the sword damaged.

<sup>721</sup> Turk 1994: 158-160; Teržan 1990a: 71.


<sup>722</sup> Vitri 1983: 142-144. The swords were included by A. Harding amongst the Antenna type hilt sword of the Weltenburg type dated into the transition HaB3/C1 which, as expected, fit the distribution of this type on the territory of central Europe and Italy (Harding 1995: 81-82, T. 33: 253). When analyzing and publishing finds from the territory of former Yugoslavia, the author was not acquainted with new data, i.e. the inventory of these "lost" graves from the Museum in Trieste (Mizzan 1994). The semilunate razor should definitely be included into the Monterozzi type dated into HaB2-B3, according to V. Bianco Peroni (1979: 116) (fig. 79: 5).

<sup>723</sup> Gabrovec 1983: 86, Sl. 9: 25; Gabrovec 1987b: 156, T. XVI: 10.

<sup>724</sup> Turk 1994: 159.


<sup>725</sup> Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 41A; Pacciarelli 2001: 250-251, 255, Fig. 136C.

<sup>726</sup> It seems that, according to the finds and their new dating, this could also be the dating for graves 136 and 165 from the necropolis in Brežec. The dating into the 8<sup>th</sup> century (Mizzan 1994) could not be supported any more.



**Slika 81.** Karta rasprostranjenosti igala tipa Sirolo Numana: I. (●), II. (■) i III. (▲) varijante (nadopunjeno prema Lucentini 2007) (Lista 18).

**Figure 81.** Distribution map of the pins of the Sirolo Numana type: I. (●), II. (■) and III. (▲) variants (supplemented after Lucentini 2007) (List 18).



**Slika 82.** Karta rasprostranjenosti glasináčkog tipa igala (●) te lokalnih varijanti tipa Gorica (■) i Colli del Tronto (▲) (Lista 19).

**Figure 82.** Distribution map of the Glasinac type pins (●) and the local variants of Gorica (■) and Colli del Tronto types (▲) (List 19).

Prema podacima o istraživanjima tumula na Gromačici, grob 7 se nalazio nešto izvan koncentracije ostalih grobova. Kako daljnja istraživanja nisu provedena podataka za bilo koju precizniju analizu prostorne ili strukturne klasifikacije nedostaje. Oprema pokojnika, tj. mačonoša je standardna ali i izuzetna, ne samo u lokalnom nego i u regionalnom smislu toga vremena. Temeljem iznesenih analogija i argumenata, te shodno dataciji igle s vazasto oblikovanim glavicom, mač s ostacima okova korica, jedinstveni primjerak takvih obilježja na obalama Kvarnera, treba vremenski paralelizirati s PF1, tj. s villanovskim I. horizontom (HaB2-B3), odnosno opredijeliti ga u početke 9. stoljeća, a moguće i na sam kraj 10. stoljeća korigirane periodizacije.<sup>726</sup> Osim što upućuje na izravne kontakte s italjskim prostorom, možda nam taj mač sugerira na, već otprilike poznatu, metodu adoptiranja kako predmeta tako i ideja, te njihovu preobrazbu u specifičan regionalni i/ili individualni lokalni opus kao što su to, naime, mačevi iz Brežeca i Gromačice.

Pod određenim okolnostima, možda bi se u istom vremenskom kontekstu mogao tumačiti i nož iz Osora (kat. 99, sl. 41) koji je predstavljen samo u starijoj literaturi.<sup>727</sup> S obzirom na to, kao i osnovne morfološke naznake, izvijenog sječiva s naglašenim hrptom koji linearno prelazi u trnastu ručku, dijelom oštećenu, možda bi ga mogli približiti grupi jednoj od varijanti noževa tipa Bismantova koji su vrlo omiljeni, i stoga prilično rasprostranjeni tip na prostoru srednje i sjeverne Italije kraja BF i prijelaza na PF.<sup>728</sup> Srodne noževa poznajemo iz Solkan-Soča i nekropole Brežec.<sup>729</sup>

No vratimo se još jednom brežečkom grobu 165. Zbog bogatog repertoara nalaza pogoduje mnoštvu interpretacija različitih karaktera, a u daljnjoj diskusiji osobito je vrijedan zbog prisustva igle tipa Sirolo

context (cat. 99, fig. 41).<sup>727</sup> In that respect and with regard to its morphological characteristics – a bent blade with an accentuated back which proceeds linearly into the spine-like, partly damaged handle – it could be included into a variant of knives of the Bismantova type, which were a very popular and consequently widely spread type on the territory of central and northern Italy at the end of BF and at the turn to PF.<sup>728</sup> Related knives are known from the Soča River in Solkan and from the necropolis in Brežec.<sup>729</sup>

Due to its rich inventory, grave 165 from Brežec allows a multitude of interpretations of different type, but it will be particularly valuable in the future discussion, because of the presence of a pin of the Sirolo Numana type.<sup>730</sup> This type, defined by L. G. Carancini,<sup>731</sup> is an element of attire that also indicates the beginning of the Iron Age, as assumed for the territory of the western Adriatic coast. In addition, it is significant for the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the Picenian culture, which runs parallel to the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the Villanova culture.<sup>732</sup> Since these pins were often discussed in the more recent literature, new data profoundly changed earlier accepted interpretations concerning their typology, distribution and the location of their possible production.<sup>733</sup> So far, although partial, the basic typology proposed by Nora Lucentini seems the most complete and, in terms of distribution and duration, the most reliable one. According to Lucentini's classification, the two Kvarner region pins – one from Osor (cat. 53, fig. 80: 1)<sup>734</sup> and another from Cres<sup>735</sup> (fig. 80-81) – should be included into the 1<sup>st</sup> most numerous group or variant of pins of the Sirolo Numana type. This group consists of examples with a vase-shaped head and

<sup>726</sup> Izgleda da bi to mogla biti i vremenska odrednica za grobove 136 i 165 brežečke nekropole sukladno popratnim priložima i njihovim novijim datacijama. Dataciju 8. stoljeća (Mizzan 1994) više nije moguće podržavati.

<sup>727</sup> Klodič 1885: III-IV, Fig. 13.

<sup>728</sup> Bianco Peroni 1976: 58-61.

<sup>729</sup> Šinkovec 1995: T. 35: 234; vidi sliku 79.

<sup>727</sup> Klodič 1885: III-IV, Fig. 13.

<sup>728</sup> Bianco Peroni 1976: 58-61.

<sup>729</sup> Šinkovec 1995: T. 35: 234; See Figure 79.

<sup>730</sup> Steffè De Piero 1977: T. XXXIII: T. 165-N; Mizzan 1994: 108, T. II: 3.

<sup>731</sup> Carancini 1975: 255, T. 56: 1867-1868.

<sup>732</sup> Lollini 1976: Fig. 1; Pare 1998: 322, Abb. 13: 9.

<sup>733</sup> Sakara Sučević 2004: 18-20; Lucentini 2007: 96-98, Fig. 1.

<sup>734</sup> Glogović 1989: 11, T. 7: 9.

<sup>735</sup> Blečić 2007a: 112.



Numana.<sup>730</sup> Definiran prema L. G. Caranciniju,<sup>731</sup> element je nošnje koji također obilježava početak željeznoga doba kako je to predviđano za prostor zapadne jadranske obale, poglavito za I. fazu picenske kulturne skupine koja je paralelna sa I. stupnjem villanovske kulture.<sup>732</sup> Budući da su te igle često diskutirane u recentnijoj literaturi, novi su podaci korjenito izmijenili dosadašnja ustaljena interpretiranja njihove tipologije, rasprostranjenosti i moguće produkcije.<sup>733</sup> Stoga se osnovna tipologija, iako parcijalna, koju je ponudila N. Lucentini, čini do sada najpotpunijom i distribucijski odnosno razvojno najmjerodavnijom. U tom okviru dvije igle s Kvarnera, jedna iz Osora (kat. 53, sl. 80: 1)<sup>734</sup> i jedna iz Cresa<sup>735</sup> (sl. 80-81), pripadale bi I. najbrojnijoj grupi ili varijanti igala tipa Sirolo Numana prema klasifikaciji iste autorice. Grupu karakteriziraju igle s vazastom glavicom i četiri oblikovana roščića te središnji prsten srednje veličine koji dijeli vrat na dva dijela.<sup>736</sup> Na glavi osorske igle (kat. 53, sl. 80: 1) jedva je prepoznatljivo očuvan ukras urezanoga meandra, koji zapravo odgovara ukrasu na igli tipa Porto Sant'Elpidio iz Picuga.<sup>737</sup> No zbog slabe očuvanosti ili održivosti ukrasnih motiva i detalja, preciznija tipološka analiza još uvijek nije moguća. Činjenicu podržava, nažalost, i slaba očuvanost konteksta nalaženja samih igala, pa su sigurniji podaci o nalaženju gotovo rijetki. Unatoč tomu, prostorna distribucija pokazuje kako je ta varijanta igala tipa Sirolo Numana daleko najvećim brojem zatupljena na prostoru sjevernoga Jadrana te u manjem broju u Picenumu. Istoj skupini treba pribrojiti i primjerak iz Kompolja (AMZ) koji, nepoznat N. Lucentini, zajedno s iglom iz Cjastiei di Pozzuolo predstavlja najisturenije točke rasprostiranja i vjerojatno nalaze posredničkog karaktera (sl. 80-81).

U slučaju opisane varijante, koja sasvim odgovara klasičnoj definiciji igle tipa Sirolo Numana, može se dakle doista govoriti o nošnji jadranske *koiné*, onakvom kakvom ju je razumijevao i sam R. Peroni<sup>738</sup> (sl. 81). No njezino eventualno podrijetlo i proizvodno središte treba sada tražiti na sjevernom dijelu istočne obale Jadrana, najvjerojatnije u Istri ili zaleđu<sup>739</sup> i ne na italskom kopnu što se gotovo podrazumijevalo.<sup>740</sup> S obzirom na sigurniji kontekst nalaženja u Numani, Giardini grob 1/1987, N. Lucentini datira te igle uglavnom u 8. stoljeće,<sup>741</sup> opovrgavajući time eventualnost njihova pojavljivanja već u 9. stoljeću, s čime je većina autora, koja se bavila tom tematikom bila suglasna.<sup>742</sup> Napokon, odlučujuću je ulogu u tom procesu odigrao, na početku spomenuti, inventar groba 165 iz nekropole Brežec, čija je niže predložena datacija<sup>743</sup> poslužila autorici kao dodatna afirmacija vremenskog određenja igle iz Numane u 8. stoljeće. No kako takva datacija više nije prihvatljiva, time i pozicija igle iz istoga groba mora biti korigirana barem u drugu polovinu 9. stoljeća, što bi se podudaralo i s datacijom drugih priloga u grobu.

Izuzev jasne povezanosti, karta rasprostranjenosti varijanti igala Sirolo Numana ipak odražava i određen razvoj njihove disperzije,

four formed protuberances as well as a central middle-sized ring dividing the neck into two parts.<sup>736</sup> On the head of the Osor pin (cat. 53, fig. 80: 1) a poorly preserved decoration of an incised meander can be recognized, which corresponds in form to the decoration on the pin of the Porto Sant'Elpidio type from Picugi.<sup>737</sup> However, due to the poor level of preservation or of the damaged incised motives and details, a more precise typological analysis is still not possible. This is unfortunately also supported by the poor amount of information concerning the contexts of their discoveries, so that more concrete or precise information about the finds are very rare. Still, the spatial distribution demonstrates that this variant of pins of the Sirolo Numana type is by far most numerous present on the territory of the northern Adriatic, and with a smaller number of examples in Picenum. An example from Kompolja (AMZ), unknown to N. Lucentini, should be added to the same group. The Kompolja example and the pin from Cjastiei di Pozzuolo represent the furthest points of distribution and, most probably, finds which reached their final destination by trade (fig. 80-81).

In the case of the described variant, which exactly fits into the classical definition of pins of the Sirolo Numana type, one can indeed speak about the attire of the Adriatic *koiné*, as perceived by R. Peroni<sup>738</sup> himself (fig. 81). However, its possible origin and production center should be looked for on the territory of the eastern coast of the northern Adriatic – most probably in Istria or its hinterland,<sup>739</sup> and not in Italy as it was almost self-evident.<sup>740</sup> Due to a secure context of discovery in Numana in grave 1/1987, N. Lucentini dated these pins mostly into the 8<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>741</sup> refuting the possibility of their appearance already in the 9<sup>th</sup> century, which was the dating accepted by a majority of authors dealing with this topic.<sup>742</sup> Finally, a decisive role in this process was played by the aforementioned inventory of grave 165 from the necropolis of Brežec whose younger dating<sup>743</sup> served to the author as a further argument for dating the Numana pin into the 8<sup>th</sup> century. Since such dating is not acceptable any more, the dating of the pins from the same grave should be corrected at least into the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, which would correspond to the dating of the other goods from that grave.

Except for the clear link, the distribution map of pins of the Sirolo Numana type still reflects a certain evolution of their dispersal, i.e. possible degenerated forms or local variants created according to the original form of the pin, or of the I<sup>st</sup> variant, which actually are the II<sup>nd</sup> and III<sup>rd</sup> groups according to N. Lucentini<sup>744</sup> (fig. 80; 81). On the territory of northern Dalmatia a special variant developed with a larger vase-shaped head, the so called II<sup>nd</sup> group. It was characterized by a large disc on the head, a central developed globular thickening with four pointed horn-like protuberances, and a spirally worked neck confined by two rings.<sup>745</sup> Alongside the pin from Jezerine,

<sup>730</sup> Steffè De Piero 1977: T. XXXIII: T. 165-N; Mizzan 1994: 108, T. II: 3.

<sup>731</sup> Carancini 1975: 255, T. 56: 1867, 1868.

<sup>732</sup> Lollini 1976: Fig. 1; Pare 1998: 322, Abb. 13: 9.

<sup>733</sup> Sakara Sučević 2004: 18-20; Lucentini 2007: 96-98, Fig. 1.

<sup>734</sup> Glogović 1989: 11, T. 7: 9.

<sup>735</sup> Blečić 2007a: 112.

<sup>736</sup> Lucentini 2007: 96, Fig. 1: 1-12, 6A.

<sup>737</sup> Moretti 1983: T. 43: 3.

<sup>738</sup> Peroni 1973: 74, T. 23: 16.

<sup>739</sup> Lucentini 2007: 96-98.

<sup>740</sup> Peroni 1973: 74, T. 23: 16; Pare 1998: 322.

<sup>741</sup> Lucentini 2007: 98.

<sup>742</sup> Npr. usp. kod M. Sakara Sučević (2004: 20), sa svom starijom referentnom literaturom, i kod C. F. E. Parea (1998: 322, Abb. 13: 2). Za istarske nalaze usp. Cestnik 2009: 64, T. 41: 16; Mihovilić 2013: 176, Sl. 100-101.

<sup>743</sup> Mizzan 1994: 114.

<sup>736</sup> Lucentini 2007: 96, Fig. 1: 1-12, 6A.

<sup>737</sup> Moretti 1983: T. 43: 3.

<sup>738</sup> Peroni 1973: 74, T. 23: 16.

<sup>739</sup> Lucentini 2007: 96-98.

<sup>740</sup> Peroni 1973: 74, T. 23: 16; Pare 1998: 322.


<sup>741</sup> Lucentini 2007: 98.

<sup>742</sup> See e.g. at M. Sakara Sučević (2004: 20), with all the relevant older literature, also see C. F. E. Pare (1998: 322, Abb. 13: 2). For the finds from Istria comp. Cestnik 2009: 64, T. 41: 16; Mihovilić 2013: 176, Sl. 100-101.

<sup>743</sup> Mizzan 1994: 114.

<sup>744</sup> Lucentini 2007: 96, Fig. 1: 13-21.

<sup>745</sup> Lucentini 2007: 96, Fig. 1: 13-17. The pin from Jezerine was often interpreted and reproduced in the scientific literature which was accessible to N. Lucentini. However, inconsistencies of quotations and taking over of data led to a mistake and multiplication of its number in the works of the same author. It has to be stressed that we are speaking about a single pin from grave 6 from



**Slika. 83.** 1: igla iz Areve gromile I (prema Benac, Čović 1957), 2: ukrasna garnitura s astragalnog pojasa iz Klosa (prema Kurti 1978), 3: privjesci na pektoralu tipa Zaton-Ancona (prama Batović 1981).

**Figure 83.** 1: pin from Areava gromila I (after Benac, Čović 1957), 2: decoration garniture of astragal belt from Klos (after Kurti 1978), 3: pendants on a pectoral of Zaton-Ancona type (after Batović 1981).

odnosno moguće degenerirane oblike ili lokalne varijante koje su nastajale po uzoru na izvorni oblik te igle, ili I. varijante, što zapravo jesu grupe II i III prema N. Lucentini<sup>744</sup> (sl. 80; 81). Tako se vjerojatno na prostoru sjeverne Dalmacije razvijala posebna varijanta igle s većom vazasto oblikovanom glavicom, tzv. grupa II. Obilježava je veliki disk na glavi, središnje razvijeno kuglasto zadebljanje sa četiri zašiljena roščića i spiralno obrađen vrat ograničen sa dva prstena.<sup>745</sup> Osim igle iz Jezerina pribrojiti joj treba, također iz zaleđa, iglu iz Zvonigrada koja tako može predstavljati poveznicu preko koje je mogao korespondirati pravac zadarski poluotok – dolina Une (sl. 81).

Opisane igle N. Lucentini uspoređuje sa sličnim iglama tzv. glasináčkog tipa, koje također imaju zašiljene istake na kuglasto oblikovanom vratu s cilindričnim nastavcima, što su učinili znatno prije nje i Z. Marić i D. Glogović.<sup>746</sup> Naime, i u ovome je slučaju usporedba predmeta samo formalne naravi jer igle iz Glasinca, iz Ilijaka II/1, Taline IX, i Ara-

another find also from the hinterland, the one from Zvonigrad should be added to this group, as it can as such represent the connections between the peninsula of Zadar and the valley of the Una River (fig. 81).

N. Lucentini compared, like Z. Marić and D. Glogović did much earlier, the described pins with similar pins of the so called Glasinac type that also have pointed horn-like protuberances on a globular thickening of the neck with cylindrical thorns,<sup>746</sup> In this case, the comparison of the artifacts is only formal, since the pins from Glasinac, from Ilijak II/1, Taline IX, and the Areava gromila<sup>747</sup> as well as the pins from Gorica and Drinovci – type Gorica<sup>748</sup> (fig. 82; 83: 1), have completely different stylistic characteristics, let alone functional ones (fig. 79). They were determined as a feature of the IVb/c phase of the Glasinac culture, whereas the pin from Jezerine was included into the IVa phase of the same cultural milieu.<sup>749</sup> R. Peroni did not only accept this, but he also defined, with the help of the chronological distinction between the given pins and those from Jezerine and Glasinac, a possible line of development of the local variant which originated from the "Italic

<sup>744</sup> Lucentini 2007: 96, Fig. 1: 13-21.

<sup>745</sup> Lucentini 2007: 96, Fig. 1: 13-17. Igla iz Jezerina često je interpretirana i reproducirana u stručnoj literaturi koja je N. Lucentini bila dostupna. No zbog nedosljednosti citiranja i preuzimanja podataka, dovelo je do zabune i multipliranja njezina broja kod iste autorice, iako je riječ samo o jednoj jedinjoj igli i to iz groba 6 nekropole u Jezerinama (Marić 1968: 12, 78, T. I: 31). Također, treba navesti kako je igla iz Osora bila publicirana znatno ranije, pa je osim kod C. Marchesettia (1924: Fig. 22: 3), nalazimo sasvim korektno ilustriranu u radu A. Ritera Klodiča (1885: Fig. 5).

<sup>746</sup> Lucentini 2007: 96; Marić 1968: 12; Glogović 1989: 11-12.


the necropolis of Jezerine (Marić 1968: 12, 78, T. I: 31). Also, we have to point out that the pin from Osor was published earlier and besides in the publication of C. Marchesetti (1924: Fig. 22: 3), there is a nice reproduction in the work of Anton Riter Klodič (1885: Fig. 5).

<sup>746</sup> Lucentini 2007: 96; Marić 1968: 12; Glogović 1989: 11-12.

<sup>747</sup> Benac, Čović 1957: 35, T. XX: 7, 9; T. XXI: 6, Čović 1987: 595.

<sup>748</sup> Čović 1971b: 306, T. IV: 4, 6-7.

<sup>749</sup> Benac, Čović 1957: 35, 50, 56-57; Čović 1965: 67-68.



**Slika 84.** Igle s istakama na glavi iz – 1: Löfkend (prema Papadopoulou et al. 2007), 2-3: Colli del Tronto (prema Lucentini 2002c), 4: Erdut (prema Metzner-Nebelsick 2002).

**Figure 84.** Pins with the protuberances on the head: – 1: Löfkend (after Papadopoulou et al. 2007), 2-3: Colli del Tronto (after Lucentini 2002c), 4: Erdut (after Metzner-Nebelsick 2002).

reve gromile 1,<sup>747</sup> kao i igle iz Gorice i Drinovaca – izdvojene kao tip Gorica<sup>748</sup> (sl. 82; 83: 1), imaju sasvim drugačije morfološke i stilističke odlike, a da o funkcionalnosti i ne govorimo (sl. 79). One su određene kao obilježje glasinacke IVb/c faze, dok je igla iz Jezerina uvrštena u fazu IVa istog kulturološkog miljea.<sup>749</sup> To ne samo da je prihvatio R. Peroni, nego je uz pomoć vremenske distinkcije navedenih igala, igala iz Jezerina i Glasinca, definirao upravo moguću razvojnu liniju lokalne varijante koja se razvila iz "italskog tipa" igle Sirolo Numa-na.<sup>750</sup> No u odnosu na tadašnje spoznaje i tom se tipu igala kvantitativno znatno povećao broj, a način njihova rasprostiranja ukazao je na heterogenost i daljnji razvoj pojedinih varijanti (sl. 81).

Ukratko, iglama iz Arareve gromile gotovo identičnu paralelu nalazimo kod igle iz, ne tako udaljenog, tumula u Gotovuši, grob 4/2,<sup>751</sup> a vrlo srodna poznata je i iz tumula u Lofkëndu kod Apollonije (sl. 84: 1).<sup>752</sup> Njima su formalno vrlo srodne bikonične perle ili privjesci, tj. članci astragalnih pojaseva ili ukrasnih garnitura kako iz prostora glasinacke kulturne skupine tako još više iz prostora sjeverne Albanije, tj. srodnog kulturnog prostora Mati. Tom određenju zasigurno pripadaju i nalaz perla iz Lisjevog polja,<sup>753</sup> koji se najviše približava i prostorno bliskim ukrasnim člancima specifičnim za prostor Skadarskog areala i područja doline Mati, npr. iz Shtoji, iz Klosa (sl. 83: 2) ili Burrela, gdje su kao prepoznavajući element ženske nošnje dugog trajanja datirani od 8. pa sve do 5. stoljeća.<sup>754</sup>

Njima pak treba pribrojiti identične nalaze dvaju privjesaka/članaka iz groba 12 nekropole Dragišić,<sup>755</sup> na čiju je pozornost ukazala već i D. Glogović.<sup>756</sup> Ona ih je interpretirala kao moguće zatvarače igala,

type" of Sirolo Naumana pin.<sup>750</sup> However, compared to the conceptions of that time, the number of pins has increased dramatically, and the manner of their distribution pointed at the heterogeneity and further development of single variants (fig. 81).

To conclude, an almost identical comparison to the pins from Arareva gromila could be observed in grave 4/2 in the closely located tumulus in Gotovuša,<sup>751</sup> and a very similar one is known from the tumulus in Lofkënd near Apollonia<sup>752</sup> (fig. 84: 1). Formally very similar to them are byconical pearls or pendants, i.e. elements of astragal belts or decoration garnitures from the territory of the Glasinac culture and even more from the territory of northern Albania, i.e. the similar Mati culture. Also the finds of pearls from Lisjevo polje belong to this definition,<sup>753</sup> which is most similar to the also territorially close decorative segments specific of the territory of the Skadar lake and the valleys of Mati – as for example Shtoj, Klos (fig. 83: 2) or Burrel, where as distinct elements of female attire they have been dated into the 8<sup>th</sup> and all the way to the 5<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>754</sup>

An identical find of two pendants/segments from grave 12 of the necropolis in Dragišić<sup>755</sup>, already pointed out by D. Glogović, should be added to them.<sup>756</sup> She interpreted them as possible pin fasteners, in line with the reconstruction by Š. Batović from that period,<sup>757</sup> although they were put on the pin itself and could not have served as fasteners. Still, this seems not to be a satisfying explanation with regard to the types of pins and forms of pendants/segments. Also questionable was the idea of Z. Brusić, who claimed that these pins, due to their large dimensions and the so-called fastener, but also the fact that they occur in pairs, could have served as knitting needles.<sup>758</sup>

<sup>747</sup> Benac, Čović 1957: 35, T. XX: 7, 9; XLI: 6, Čović 1987: 595.

<sup>748</sup> Čović 1971b: 306, T. IV: 4, 6-7.

<sup>749</sup> Benac, Čović 1957: 35, 50, 56-57; Čović 1965: 67-68.

<sup>750</sup> Peroni 1976: 109-110.

<sup>751</sup> Marković 1966: 222, T. II: 15.

<sup>752</sup> Papadopoulou et al. 2007: 127, Fig. 26: b.

<sup>753</sup> Srejović, Marković 1980: Pl. IV: 9-13; Marković 1997: T. 2: 3.

<sup>754</sup> Kurti 1976: T. IV: 5, 10, 11; Kurti 1978: T. III: 2; T. V: 3; T. XII: 11; Koka 1990: 55, T. III: 26. Privjesci-članci poznati su još iz sjevernoalbanskih nalazišta Kuše i Bileka (Nopcsa 1912. 171-173, Fig. 6), a iz Glasinca jedan privjesak potječe iz Ilijaka XXII/1 (Benac, Čović 1957: T. XXXIV: 17). U Donjoj Dolini smatraju se vodećim oblicima II.b faze koja je datirana između 600. i 500. godine, sinkronizirana s fazom IVc glasinacke kulture, budući da, između ostalih, jedan takav privjesak potječe iz groba 1 na gredi N. Šokića, datiranog zajedno s dvopetljustom lučnom fibulom, fibulom s pravokutnom nogom i s fibulom tipa Šmarjeta (Marić 1964: T. X: 27, T. XXV: 5). B. Teržan je ukazala na važnost pojavljivanja astragalnih pojaseva u kompletnoj ženskoj opremi, odnosno pojavljivanje pojedinih privjesaka/članaka kao elementa možda dječje nošnje (Teržan 1984b: 203-205, Sl. 3), što bi se vjerojatno moglo razumijevati i u slučaju grobova iz Donje Doline.

<sup>755</sup> Brusić 2000: T. XIII: 1-2.

<sup>756</sup> Glogović 1989: 12.

<sup>750</sup> Peroni 1976: 109-110.

<sup>751</sup> Marković 1966: 222, T. II: 15.

<sup>752</sup> Papadopoulou et al. 2007: 127, Fig. 26: b.

<sup>753</sup> Srejović, Marković 1980: Pl. IV: 9-13; Marković 1997: T. 2: 3.

<sup>754</sup> Kurti 1976: T. IV: 5, 10, 11; Kurti 1978: T. III: 2; T. V: 3; T. XII: 11; Koka 1990: 55, T. III: 26. Pendants-segments are known also from north-Albanian sites Kuše and Bilek (Nopcsa 1912. 171-173, Fig. 6) and from Glasinac. A single larger piece was discovered in Ilijak XXII/1 (Benac, Čović 1957: T. XXXIV: 17). In Donja Dolina they are considered the leading form of the IIb phase, which was dated in the 6<sup>th</sup> century and synchronized with the phase IVc of Glasinac culture. One such pendant comes from the grave 1 on the patch of N. Šokić, dated with the two-looped fibula, a fibula with a square foot and a Šmarjeta type fibula (Marić 1964: T. X: 27; T. XXV: 5). B. Teržan demonstrated the importance of the appearance of astragal belts in the complete female attire and the appearance of individual pendants/segments as elements of a possible child's attire (Teržan 1984b: 203-205, Sl. 3), which might have been the case in graves from Donja Dolina.

<sup>755</sup> Brusić 2000: T. XIII: 1-2.

<sup>756</sup> Glogović 1989: 12.

<sup>757</sup> Batović 1981: 120, Sl. 10: 25.

<sup>758</sup> Brusić 2000: 10.

sukladno ondašnjoj rekonstrukciji Š. Batovića,<sup>757</sup> iako su one bile navršene na samu iglu i stoga nisu mogle izravno služiti kao zatvarači. Ipak, čini se, i s obzirom na tipove igala i oblik privjeska/članka, kako to dakle nije zadovoljavajuća interpretacija, jednako kao što je i ideja Z. Brusića da su te igle, zbog svojih velikih dimenzija i tih tzv. zatvarača (?), kao i zbog čestog nalaženja u paru, mogle služiti kao pletače igle,<sup>758</sup> zapravo upitna. Kako se i ti privjesci, odnosno članci međusobno također tipološki razlikuju, iglama iz Glasinca najbliži su privjesci s dugačkim cilindričnim istakama, ponekad i narebrenim, koje su česte upravo na području kulture Mati i prije istaknutih nalazišta (sl. 82).<sup>759</sup>

No zapanjujuća činjenica je da su srodne igle zabilježene također i u Picenumu. U Colli del Tronto istražena su do sada tri primjerka takvih igala, koje su interpretirane kao posljedica kontakata upravo s područjem glasinačkog kulturnog kruga tijekom 8. i 7. stoljeća.<sup>760</sup> One su nešto drugačijih osobina jer nemaju cilindričnih istaka na vrhu glave, ali im je vrat narebren a središnji prsten ponavlja ukras glave samo manjih dimenzija (sl. 84: 2-3). Budući da na Glasincu nalazimo najviše varijanti tog tipa igala ne može više biti nikakve sumnje u izvornost njihove glasinačke kreacije iz bogatog stvaralačkog opusa nakita i nošnje, koji se prenosio na susjedna i potpuno organski povezana područja (sl. 80). Osim iz prostora Mati, gdje su se održali najvećim dijelom i kao privjesci/članci, bile su uključene i u vodeće oblike II. faze želznog doba na delmatskom području i pripisivane također "izrazitoj mjesnoj stvaralačkoj posebnosti!"<sup>761</sup> U nekim se oblicima koncepta razmjene i kulturoloških transfera, unutar jadranske *koiné*, taj oblik specifično muške nošnje prenio i na suprotnu obalu Jadrana gdje se razvija u evidentno svoj lokalni tip (sl. 82; 83: 2-3). Tako i po pitanju tzv. glasinačkih igala omiljena hipoteza R. Peronija nije zaživjela, a njihovo zapadnobalkansko podrijetlo, povezano sa širenjem snažnog (geometrijskog) stila unutar (trans) jadranskog bazena, iznova je dokazano.

U smislu pojave lokalnih tipova valja istaknuti i iglu iz Erduta (sl. 84: 4).<sup>762</sup> C. Metzner-Nebelsick povezala ju je po oblikovanju glave s iglama iz Glasinca, ali bliže s iglom iz Arareve gromile (sl. 83: 1) zbog slično izvedenog narebrenog vrata, što je ujedno poslužilo kao kriterij udaljavanja od igle iz Ilijaka.<sup>763</sup> No taj je problem naveo i na razilaženje u njihovom kronološkom određenju pa autorica navodi zastarjelu dataciju (Va) koja je do tada u literaturi bila već višestruko revidirana.<sup>764</sup> Tako je igla iz Ilijaka smještena u stupanj IVb, odnosno kraj 8. i 7. stoljeće, što bi posve odgovaralo željenom kronološkom okviru igli iz Erduta. S druge strane, toj je igli ista autorica približila i igle iz groba 15 u Gorszewicama,<sup>765</sup> koje pokazuju udaljenu srodnost samo po obliku glavice, a uz koje se pored igala i ogrlice, nalazio i antropo-orbitomorfni privjesak. Interpretacijom gradiva autorica je došla do zaključka da je možda pokopana ženska osoba iz Gorszewica potjecala negdje iz prostora istočne Slavonije.<sup>766</sup> Hipoteza svakako nije dokaziva, a još je manje uvjerljiva, ako je osnovnom referencom uzeta samo igla slično oblikovane glavice inače heterogenog priloženog

Since also these pendants made of segments typologically vary among themselves, the pins from Glasinac can be best compared to pendants with elongated cylindrical protuberances, sometimes even ribbed, which are frequent on the territory of the Mati culture and the aforementioned sites (fig. 82).<sup>759</sup>

It is fascinating that similar pins were discovered also in Picenum. In Colli del Tronto three such examples were discovered and they were interpreted as the result of contacts with the Glasinac cultural area during the 8<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>760</sup> They are slightly different since they lack the protuberances on the head. In fact, their neck is more ribbed and the central ring repeats the decoration of the head in a diminished scale (fig. 84: 2-3). Since it is on Glasinac that most variants of these pins are found, there is no doubt that they were a local creation and a part of the immense and creative opus of jewelry and attire, which spread also to neighboring and organically connected areas (fig. 80). Beside the area of Mati, where these forms were preserved mostly as pendants/segments, they were included into among the leading forms of the II<sup>nd</sup> phase of the Iron Age in Dalmatia and ascribed also to a "distinctly local specialty of production!"<sup>761</sup> In some forms of the concept of exchange and transfer of cultural elements, during the formation of the Adriatic *koiné*, this form of male attire was transferred to the opposite coast of the Adriatic, where it developed into an evidently local type (fig. 80; 83: 2-3). In the same way, R. Peroni's favourite hypothesis concerning the question of the so called Glasinac pins did not take hold, whereas their western Balkan origin, connected to the diffusion of a strong (geometric) style within the trans-Adriatic basin, was re-confirmed.

As regards the appearance of local types, the pin from Erdut (fig. 84: 4) should be pointed out.<sup>762</sup> Due to the shaping of the head Carola Metzner-Nebelsick connected it to the pins from Glasinac, precisely with the pin from Arareva gromila (fig. 83: 1) – mostly due to a similarly ribbed neck, which was used as the main criteria to distance it from the pin from Ilijak.<sup>763</sup> This problem created a discordant of their dating and the author used an out of date dating into the phase Va, which was revised several times in the literature.<sup>764</sup> So, the pin from Ilijak was included into phase IVb at the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> and the 7<sup>th</sup> century, which would completely comply with the desired chronological framework of the pin from Erdut. On the other hand, the author compared it with the pin from grave 15 in Gorszewice,<sup>765</sup> which demonstrates a distant affinity only due to the shape of the head. Alongwith the pin, also an antropo-orbitomorphic pendant was discovered. Discussing them, the author mentioned the possibility that the inhumed woman from Gorszewice originated from somewhere in eastern Slavonia.<sup>766</sup> This hypothesis cannot be proved and is even less convincing since only a pin with a non-similar shaped head was used as the basic reference out of a heterogeneous grave inventory consisting of jewelry and attire. It is interesting to point out that the neck of the pin from Erdut is not ribbed, but it is segmented and ends with a broader ring ornamented with geometric zigzag motives, which reminds of the pins from Colli del Tronto (fig. 84: 2-4).

<sup>757</sup> Batović 1981: 120, Sl. 10: 25.

<sup>758</sup> Brusić 2000: 10.

<sup>759</sup> Kurti 1976: T. IV: 3-4.

<sup>760</sup> Lucentini 2002: 46-47, Fig. 55.

<sup>761</sup> Batović 1986: 30, Sl. 3: 3; Sl. 5: 22-23.

<sup>762</sup> U nekoj udaljenijoj varijanti igala rebrastoga vrata s istakama, možda možemo razumijevati i iglu iz ratničkog groba iz Villacha, gdje je vjerojatno bila riječ o dvojnomo ukopu (Nebelsick, Kaus 2000: 12-130, 135, Abb. 8; usp. Teržan 1990b: 200).

<sup>763</sup> Metzner-Nebelsick 2002: 430, T. 107: 16.

<sup>764</sup> Npr. Čović 1987: 582.

<sup>765</sup> Pieczyński 1954: 108-109, Ryc. 9; Metzner-Nebelsick 2002: 431, Abb. 192.

<sup>766</sup> Metzner-Nebelsick 2002: 431.

<sup>759</sup> Kurti 1976: T. IV: 3-4.

<sup>760</sup> Lucentini 2002: 46-47, Fig. 55.

<sup>761</sup> Batović 1986: 30, Sl. 3: 3; Sl. 5: 22-23.

<sup>762</sup> We can comprehend as a distant variant of pins with a ribbed neck and protuberances also the pin from the warrior's grave from Villach, where we might be actually observing a double burial (Nebelsick, Kaus 2000: 12-130, 135, Abb. 8; comp. Teržan 1990b: 200).

<sup>763</sup> Metzner-Nebelsick 2002: 430, T. 107: 16.

<sup>764</sup> For example Čović 1987: 582.

<sup>765</sup> Pieczyński 1954: 108-109, Ryc. 9; Metzner-Nebelsick 2002: 431, Abb. 192.

<sup>766</sup> Metzner-Nebelsick 2002: 431.



**Slika 85.** Urna iz Vrbnika? (foto: M. Blečić Kavur).

**Figure 85.** Urn from Vrbnik? (Photo: M. Blečić Kavur).

inventara nakita i nošnje. Zanimljivo je svakako navesti da igla iz Erduta nema narebren nego člankovit vrat koji na kraju završava širim prstenom ukrašenim geometrijskim cik-cak motivima, što sve asocira i na igle iz Colli del Tronto (sl. 84: 2-4).

Krug se zatvara srodnim, ili gotovo istim, privjescima iz zadarskog Zaton (sl. 83: 3). Naime, ondje je pak 13 privjesaka obješeno na rub ptičje lađe raskošnog pektoral tipa Zaton-Ancona istraženog u grobu 6, nađenog, uostalom, uz sedam fibula s jantaram na luku različitih veličina i tipoloških obilježja. Grob, kao i pektoral, valja smatrati predstavnikom III. faze liburnske kulture, ali u vrijeme 7. stoljeća, u odnosu vrijednosti bogatstva i prestiža njegove nositeljice i unutar statusne hijerarhije užeg liburnskog teritorija.<sup>767</sup>

Naposljetku, vremenu početnog starijeg željeznog doba, pripadat će i manja bikonična urna iz Vrbnika (sl. 85),<sup>768</sup> s gotovo identičnom paralelom kod urne iz nasuprotnog, senjskog područja.<sup>769</sup> Obje urne imaju karakteristično zaobljeno bikonično tijelo, visoko i naglašeno izvijen rub te suženu ravnu stopu. Obilježavaju ih, naime, dvije horizontalno postavljene polukružne ručke na središnjem dijelu trbuha, paralelno sa svake strane. Pa iako postoji nekoliko primjeraka i na samom matičnom prostoru Liburna koji imaju istovjetan oblik tijela i horizontalno postavljene ručkice, u ovome slučaju izravne paralele ili idejne uzore valja iznova vidjeti kod italjskog keramografskog obrtništva, osobito na prostoru nasuprotnih Picena, gdje su takve posude određene njegovoj I. željeznodobnoj fazi, upravo pored igala tipa Sirolo Numana i kasnih dvodijelnih zmijastih fibula.<sup>770</sup>

The circle is closing with similar or even identical pendants from Zaton (fig. 83: 3). There, 13 pendants were hung upon the edge of the bird-boat of a prestigious pectoral of Zaton-Ancona type discovered in grave 6, together with 7 fibulae with amber on the bow of different types and sizes. The grave, as the pectoral, have to be considered as representatives of the III<sup>rd</sup> phase of the Liburnian culture in the 7<sup>th</sup> century, and evaluated in relation to the prestige and wealth of the woman wearing it and within the status hierarchy of the core of Liburnian territory.<sup>767</sup>

Finally, also a small byconical urn from Vrbnik (fig. 85)<sup>768</sup> should be dated into the beginning of the Early Iron Age, with an almost identical comparison from the opposite side in Senj.<sup>769</sup> Both of them have a typical rounded byconical body, a high and diverted rim, a narrow foot and two horizontally positioned semicircular handles on the lower part of the body positioned on both sides. Although there are several examples of urns discovered on the core territory of the Liburni, which demonstrate a similar shaping of the body and position of handles, direct comparisons or role models have to be searched in the Italian pottery production, especially on the territory of Picenum, where similar vessels were determined as belonging to their I<sup>st</sup> phase of the Iron Age, together with pins of the Sirolo Numana type and late two-part serpentine fibulae.<sup>770</sup>

<sup>767</sup> Batović 1965: 63, Sl. 15; Glogović 2003: 36, 38-39, T. 37: 265-268; T. 41: 315-317; usp. Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014.

<sup>768</sup> Visina: 26,4 cm; pr. ruba: 18 cm; najveće širine trbuha: 24 cm; pr. stope: 7 cm.

<sup>769</sup> Ljubović 2000: 164, kat. 337.

<sup>770</sup> Usp. Pare 1998: 322-323, Abb. 13.

<sup>767</sup> Batović 1965: 63, Sl. 15; Glogović 2003: 36, 38-39, T. 37: 265-268; T. 41: 315-317; comp. Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014.

<sup>768</sup> Hight: 26.4 cm; rim diameter: 18 cm; max with: 24 cm; base diameter: 7 cm.

<sup>769</sup> Ljubović 2000: 164, cat. 337.

<sup>770</sup> Comp. Pare 1998: 322-323, Abb. 13.



## Društvena činjenica i povijesna istina

Uvodom u prethodno poglavlje istaknuta je važnost, a nagoviješteni su i priželjkivani rezultati koji se postižu tradicionalnom arheološkom metodologijom tipološke klasifikacije, kronološke determinacije, prostorne distribucije te moguće kulturološke interpretacije. Sublimirajući tako dobivene podatke u strukturi njihove povijesne vertikale, te u odnosu na dosadašnje temeljitije ili paušalnije studije prostora sjevernog Jadrana, ponajprije se izdvaja brojnost nalazišta i njihova različitost, bilo u fizičkom bilo u interpretativnom smislu. Najbolje su poznate i istraživane nekropole i tumuli, a u novije vrijeme brojnije se istražuju naselja i špilje.<sup>771</sup> Ta su nam nalazišta, iako nedovoljno dobro poznata ili bez pobližih podataka istraživana u prošlim stoljećima, uz pojedinačne nalaze iz različitih medija, sačuvala brojnu građu koja je već dijelom i na razne načine bila vrednovana u određenim, i u ovome radu korištenim studijama. No jednako je tako nerijetko, pa čak i u novijim raspravama bila diskreditirana, ignorirana ili posve pogrešno interpretirana.

Zemljopisno dakle, od Podvelebita pa do istočne obale Istre, i od Kastavštine pa do ulaza u Kvarnerić (linija Lošinj – Novalja) prostire se kvarnerski bazen koji prirodno ne predstavlja čvrsto homogeno područje, jer to nije niti moguće. To je heterogeni prostor koji se poput lagune rasplinjava na svojim krajevima i stapa s drugim, susjednim ekološkim i kulturološkim miljeima (sl. 1-2). No on se ipak ponašao i djelovao koherentno i kohezivno, dakle, kao značenjsko smisljeno zaokružena cjelina u svim svojim prirodnim i antropogenim očitovanjima. S obzirom na prikupljeni uzorak i postignutu razinu relevantnog iščitavanja ljudskog djelovanja u tome prostoru nije moguće preciznije odrediti im razloge takva nastajanja. Ali, jasno je svakako da ono nije bilo samo prisutno u vremenu opasnosti i nepravilnosti, već blagostanja i prosperiteta, ljudskog kreativnog napora, kada su proizvodnja i stvaralaštvo, razmjena i trgovina, uvjetovane razvijenom ideološkom i religioznom misli, aktivno i recipročno razvijali specifične mjesne oblike i odnose ponašanja. Sasvim logično, namjerna je pak i učestala, odnosno sve učestalija, potrošnja, te paralelna akumulacija dobara i/ili bogatstava uvjetovala diskriminaciju, odnosno hijerarhizaciju mjesta, zajednica i napokon pojedinaca.

Naselja koja su zastupljena na prostoru Kvarnera većinom su gradinska i samo manjim brojem priobalna (sl. 86). Među njima

## A social fact and the political truth

In the introduction to the previous chapter the importance of results achieved by applying the traditional archaeological methodology of typological classification, chronological determination and possible cultural interpretation was pointed out, and the desired results were announced. Sublimating the acquired data in the structure of their historical sequence and in relation to the detailed and perfunctorily studies of the northern Adriatic territory available so far, the number of discussed sites must be emphasized as well as their variability – their physical characteristics and their interpretations. Most of the attention was paid to the necropoles and tumuli, whereas the focus of research has recently been shifted towards settlement and cave sites.<sup>771</sup> The sites discussed, although insufficiently known and without detailed information, were excavated in the past centuries – the excavated finds together with some other stray discoveries were discussed and evaluated in the publications used in the present volume. However, in recent discussions, the finds were often discredited, ignored or even completely erroneously interpreted.

In geographical terms, the Kvarner basin spreads from Podvelebit to the eastern coast of Istria, from the region of Kastav to the entry into the Kvarnerić (the line from Lošinj to Novalja). Due to its natural background, it is not a homogeneous region – it is heterogeneous and it spreads like a lagoon on its ends mingling with other neighboring ecological and cultural environments (fig. 1-2). Still, it behaved and functioned in a coherent and cohesive way - as a reasonably rounded entity with its natural and anthropogenic characteristics. Due to the collected sample and achieved level of relevant recognition of human activities in this area, it is still not possible to determine the causes of their formation. However, one thing is sure, it was not present only in periods of dangers and distress, but also in those of well-being and prosperity, in periods of human creative endeavors, when production and creativity, trade and commerce stipulated by a developed ideological and religious thought, active and reciprocal, developed local forms and relations of behavior. Logically, it triggered the rise of consumption and parallel accumulation of goods/wealth which conditioned the discrimination or, in other words, hierarchisation of the region, communities and finally individuals.

The settlements on the Kvarner territory were mostly hill-forts and only a few of them were located on the coastline (fig. 86). The most important settlements were larger ones transformed into so-called

<sup>771</sup> Starac 2002; Starac 2004; Starac 2005; Starac 2006a; Starac 2006 b; Starac 2007; Komšo, Blečić 2007.

<sup>771</sup> Starac 2002; Starac 2004; Starac 2005; Starac 2006a-b; Starac 2007; Komšo, Blečić 2007.



Slika 86. Karta nalazišta obuhvaćenih u istraživanju.

Figure 86. Map presenting the sites discussed in the research.

posebnu su važnost imala ona većih razmjera koja su se i formirala u tzv. središta. Tu možemo ubrojiti naselja u Rijeci, Krku, Baški, Senju, Sv. Jurju i posebno Osoru (sl. 2; 4; 7; 15; 86).<sup>772</sup> Iako možemo pratiti kontinuitet njihova naseljavanja od kasnog brončanog doba, najviše ih se protourbano profilira na prijelazu iz brončanog u željezno doba, odnosno negdje u 10. stoljeću. Budući da je ovdje mahom riječ o značajnijim položajima, većina ih je bila kontinuirano naseljavana, sve do kraja željeznoga doba.

Uz naselja, ponajviše uz njihove ulaze i prilazne putove, bile su smještene nekropole. Prema sadašnjem stanju istraženosti možemo razlikovati nekropole na ravnom i nekropole pod tumulima, kod kojih opet razlikujemo pogrebne običaje skeletnim i spaljivanim načinom pokopavanja. Smatralo se kako je na čitavom prostoru Kvarnera prevladavao skeletni način pokopavanja pod tumulima i to najčešće zgrčenog položaja u kamenim škrinjama koji je kontinuirano, gotovo nepromijenjen, bio prisutan od kasnog brončanog doba pa sve do sutona prapovijesti. Među najznačajnijim primjerima valja navesti tumule u Šuli, osorski tumul kod Sv. Marije na groblju, tumule na Gromačici i Klačenicima, a na isti je način bila prakticirana i nekropola u Vidasima ili Dabovim stanovima u Novalji, kao i brojni drugi manji i najčešće uništeni tumuli u čitavoj regiji. Međutim, o pokopavanju spaljivanjem vrlo se malo znalo i uglavnom se kao jedini takav poznati primjer navodila nekropola pod tumulima u Garici,<sup>773</sup> kojoj se pridodavala i uništena kasnobrončanodobna nekropola na Kastvu i u Šapjanama. Ipak, novija istraživanja potvrđuju kako spaljivanje pokojnika nije bio tek izniman ili pojedinačni ritual, pri čemu se izdvajaju tumuli iz Stolniča, iz Sužana, Velog Kaslira i Batova na Krku, neko-

centers and among them the settlements in Rijeka, Bakar, Krk, Baška, Senj, Sv. Juraj and in particular Osor should be mentioned (fig. 2; 4; 7; 15; 86).<sup>772</sup> We are able to follow the continuity of their occupations since the Late Bronze Age, whereas the majority was set up at the beginning of the Early Iron Age, somewhere in the 10<sup>th</sup> century BC. Since these were important localities, they were settled almost all of the time until the end of the Late Iron Age.

Along the settlements, mostly at their entries and access routes, necropolises were located. According to the present state of research, a distinction can be made between flat necropolises and necropolises with burial tumuli, in which a further differentiation can be made between skeletal and cremation graves. It was considered that the skeletal inhumations beneath tumuli, mostly in a crouched position in stone boxes, were continuously present on the whole Kvarner territory, almost unchanged, from the Late Bronze Age until the end of prehistory. Among the most important burials, the tumuli in Šula must be mentioned, the tumulus near Sv. Marija na groblju in Osor, as well as the tumuli in Gromačica and Klačenicima. A similar construction of graves was present also on the necropolis in Dabovi stanovi in Novalja as well as in numerous smaller and mostly destroyed tumuli in the whole region. However, little was known about the cremation burials, and the only example of that kind was the necropolis with tumuli in Garica<sup>773</sup> to which also the destroyed Late Bronze Age necropolises in Kastav and Šapjane were added. Still, more recent excavations have shown that the cremation of the deceased was not a rare and isolated ritual – as documented by the tumuli from Stolnič, Sužan, Veli Kaslir and Batovo on Krk as well as several tumuli from Srem near Belej on the island of Cres,<sup>774</sup> and most probably the Late Bronze Age tumulus from Tribalj-Grizane. The cremation graves from the necropolis of Krk and Kavanela in Osor must be mentioned here,<sup>775</sup> whereas a special contribution to the understanding of this ritual of inhumation is supported by the recent discovery of a flat necropolis with cremation graves near the church of St. Petar in Osor (fig. 86).<sup>776</sup>

Therefore, it can be concluded that the burial rite on the Kvarner coast and islands was bi-ritual, i.e. both cremated and skeletal burials were present. Even the latter ritual demonstrated several differences – the deceased were inhumed in a crouched or extended positions. The number of excavated cemeteries and individual tumuli is much smaller than in the neighboring regions – especially with regard to the eminent large and wealthy necropolises of Istria, Liburnia and Japodia. However, even with the present limited segment, the graves show the existence of – at first glance – modest, but actually wealthy and diverse structured and hierarchically organized communities that inhabited this area.<sup>777</sup> Conventionally, it was considered that in this period only the ritual of skeletal inhumation of the deceased in stone chests was used. The ritual and their extended or crouched positions were also the arguments to link this area to the Liburnian cultural group.<sup>778</sup> Such a position has not been changed only by the presence of amphorae, which were used as urns in cremation burials in Stolnič and Osor, but also by the recent research on the central territory of the Liburni, where several cremation burials in urns have been discovered lately.<sup>779</sup> Consequently, it becomes obvious that in this case the

<sup>772</sup> O gradinskim naseljima na istočnoj obali Istre vidjeti kod K. Buršić-Matijašić (2007).

<sup>773</sup> Majnarić-Pandžić 2003: 42, K.

<sup>772</sup> For hill-forts on the eastern coast of Istria see K. Buršić-Matijašić (2007).

<sup>773</sup> Majnarić-Pandžić 2003: 42, K.

<sup>774</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 140; Starac 2002.

<sup>775</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 141.

<sup>776</sup> Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013.

<sup>777</sup> It is worth mentioning that a larger number of tumuli have recently been excavated on the eastern Adriatic coast from Istria to the Neretva River, and the majority was destroyed, empty or containing only individual fragments of pottery!

<sup>778</sup> For example Batović 1987: 339-390; Batović 2003: 253-348.

<sup>779</sup> Kukoč 2009b: 11-80; Kukoč 2010: 95-110; Kukoč 2011: 51-82; Marijanović (ed.) 2012.



liko tumula iz Srema kod Beleja na otoku Cresu<sup>774</sup> te vjerojatno tumuli iz Triblja-Grižane. Valja im, međutim, pridružiti i paljevinske grobove iz nekropola Krka i osorske Kavanele,<sup>775</sup> a poseban prilog poznavanju pokopavanja tim ritualom pružit će recentni nalaz urni s paljevinskim ukopima iz Osora kod crkve sv. Petra (sl. 86).<sup>776</sup>

Tako možemo zaključiti kako se na kvarnerskom priobalnom i otočnom dijelu običaj pokopavanja pokojnika vršio dvojako, incineracijom i inhumacijom, a ovaj potonji također na dva načina; ispruženog i zgrčenog položaja pokojnika. Istraženi je broj nekropola kao i pojedinačnih tumula uopće, znatno manji u odnosu na susjedna područja, pogotovo kada su čuvene velike i bogate nekropole Istre, Liburnije ili Japodije u pitanju. No već i tako malim udjelom svjedoče o naoko skromnim, a zapravo bogatstvom različitim i razmjerno strukturiranim i hijerarhiziranim zajednicama koje su ondje obitavale.<sup>777</sup> Zbog ustaljenog mišljenja o ritualu skeletnog pokopavanja u kamenim škrinjama, prostor se čitavog Kvarnera uže povezivao uz liburnsku kulturnu skupinu.<sup>778</sup> Takvo mnijenje ne mijenjaju samo predmetne stolničke ili osorska amfora kao urne, već i rezultati novijih istraživanja na samom matičnom prostoru Liburna gdje je sve više ukopa zabilježeno upravo paljevinskim načinom sahranjivanja u urnama.<sup>779</sup> Postaje sve izglednijim da u ovom slučaju načini sahranjivanja, i prakticanje različitih pogrebnih rituala povezani uz njih, neće biti odlučujući kriterij povezivanja uz određenu kulturnu ili čak etničku skupinu, već je tu riječ o istovremenim ali raznorodnim praksama načina pokopavanja.

Da je tomu moglo biti tako pokazali su segmenti do nas pristigle arheološke građe kao kulture, odnosno njihovo jasno tipološko definiranje i grupiranje, pojedine serijacije te okvirno, a transparentno i ne konačno, prostorno i kronološko rasprostiranje. Naime, materijalna kultura je kao materijalni dokaz oboje; preduvjet za antropogeno djelovanje i rezultat njegova djelovanja. Obnavljanje i transformacija arheološkog koda stvara povijesnu spoznaju o različitim socijalnim odnosima koji se neprestano sklapaju i reproduciraju,<sup>780</sup> naravno u određenom sustavu simbola. Različitost pak mjesne materijalne građe čini područje posebnim i jedinstvenim u općem krugu proizvodnje, optjecaja i pohrane, a njezina simbolička vrijednost u stalnom sukobu s tradicijom i u vječnoj težnji k novom, svakako postaje kompleksna i višeslojna. Razumijevanje namjene i svrhe simbola, odnosno njihove uloge i uporabe, moguće je razmatrati na dva načina semiologije; i to u formi semiologije komunikacije kao i u formi semiologije reprezentacije.<sup>781</sup> Tako je simbol instrument međuljudske komunikacije, kao što je zapravo i supstitut čija zamjena je ispred svega kognitivna. Pomoću oba koncepta možemo tumačiti preostalu nam i arheološki tretiranu građu. Naime, upravo su lokalizmi ti koji komunikacijom i reprezentacijom simboličkog sustava stvaraju cjelokupan model i simetrije, kao što je to razumijevao J. Barrett.<sup>782</sup> Navedeni su nalazi prikupljene građe, premda nejasnih, nepreciznih ili nepostojećih konteksta, za područje Kvarnera ned-

burial practices and the performance of different burial rites linked to the latter could not be considered to be a decisive criterion for being linked to a specific cultural or ethnical group, since these are contemporary but different burial practices.

This situation was demonstrated by segments of preserved material culture representing the past culture as a whole. Claims about the organization of past societies were derived from clear typological definitions and groupings of finds; individual seriations and general, transparent but -by no means- final, spatial and chronological distribution of finds. Knowing that, the material culture, as material evidence, is both: the prerequisite for anthropogenic activities and at the same time their result. The renewal and transformation of the archaeological code creates a historical comprehension of different social relations which were constantly created, negotiated and reproduced in a specific system of symbols.<sup>780</sup> The diversity of local material culture makes this area special and unique in the universal circle of production, circulation and preservation – its symbolic value, in constant conflict with tradition and with a perpetual tendency towards the new, becomes complex and multifaceted. Understanding the aims and causes for the symbols, their role and use, could be observed in two modes of semiology – in the form of semiology of communication as well as in the form of the semiology of representation.<sup>781</sup> In this way, the symbol becomes an instrument of human communication, actually, a substitute whose replacement is primarily cognitive. It is with the help of both concepts, that the remaining archaeological finds may be interpreted. In fact, by communicating and representing symbolic structures, those local elements are the ones that create an integral model with its symmetries, as perceived by John Barrett.<sup>782</sup> Although originating from unclear, imprecise or nonexistent contexts, the finds collected on the Kvarner region undoubtedly show, predetermining at the same time their critical evaluation in space and time, a "new-archaeological" *argumentum ad argumentum* manner.<sup>783</sup>

It is well known that unfinished hoarded artifacts show that they circulated as artifacts, but without being used – they most probably had a symbolic importance in the local circulation of gift exchange.<sup>784</sup> Actually, the phenomenon as such can be observed in the regional typological variability with the occasional presence of exclusively imported, or so-called exotic artifacts. From the Late Bronze Age and all the way to the administrative reforms of Augustus communities, that inhabited the Kvarner region, a recognizable style developed in the reproduction of individual, finished or unfinished, artifacts. These were often supplemented also with exotic artifacts, as is suggested by glass and bone beads, as well as famous amber beads that were present during the whole millennium – especially those of the Tiryms and Allumiere types from the islands of Krk and Pag (cat. 10-11; 22-24; 30; fig. 25; 29). What stands out are undoubtedly imported goods such as individual weapons, as for example the sword of the Allerona/Naue II type from Sužan (cat. 44, sl. 35), the short sword of the Italian type from Gromačica (cat. 153-154, sl. 73-74), the Guntramsdorf type winged axe from Grižane (cat. 173), or the socketed axe with the decoration of three circles in the ribbed "Y" ornament from Osor (cat. 98, sl. 41). These items highlight certain locations in the Kvarner area and thereby also their users as individuals, who again, represent the local and broader community within the cultural network of meaning. For the time being, due to the quantity and diversification of artifacts, the territory of Rijeka with its gravitating towns of Kastav and Bakar have stood out. The same applies also to Krk and Baška with the gravitating territory of Crikvenica and Senj, as well as the territory of Osor with the island archipelago (fig. 2;

<sup>774</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 140; Starac 2002.

<sup>775</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 141.

<sup>776</sup> Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013.

<sup>777</sup> Nije naodmet navesti kako je u novije vrijeme istraživani pozamašan broj tumula na istočnoj obali Jadrana, od Istre do Neretve, a gotovo ih je većina bila uništena, prazna ili samo s pokojim ulomkom keramike!

<sup>778</sup> Npr. Batović 1987: 339-390; Batović 2003: 253-348.

<sup>779</sup> Kukoč 2009b: 11-80; Kukoč 2010: 95-110; Kukoč 2011: 51-82; Marijanović (ed.) 2012.

<sup>780</sup> Barrett 1989: 305.

<sup>781</sup> Herzfeld 1992: 16.

<sup>782</sup> Barrett 1989: 313.


<sup>780</sup> Barrett 1989: 305.

<sup>781</sup> Herzfeld 1992: 16.

<sup>782</sup> Barrett 1989: 313.

<sup>783</sup> Binford 1989: 106-109.

<sup>784</sup> Bradley 1998: 36-42, 135-150; Gosden, Marschall 1999.



Slika 87. Kronološka tabela zastupljenih fibula na Kvarneru.

Figure 87. Chronological table of fibulae present on the territory of Kvarner.

vojbeno pokazali, predodređujući istovremeno, i njihovo kritičko sagledavanje kako u prostoru tako i u vremenu, i to, reklo bi se, novoarheološki *argumentum ad argumentum*.<sup>783</sup>

Poznato je kako nedovršeni pohranjeni predmeti pokazuju da su cirkulirali kao predmeti, a da se pri tomu nisu koristili. Svoj su simbolički značaj, dakle, najvjerojatnije imali u loklanom optjecanju razmjene darova.<sup>784</sup> Zapravo, fenomen se kao takav očituje u regionalnoj tipološkoj različitosti, uz prisustvo isključivo uvoženih ili tzv. egzotičnih predmeta. Već od kasnog brončanog doba pa do stupanja na snagu Augustovih administrativnih dekreta, zajednice koje su nastanjivale prostor Kvarnera razvijale su svoj vlastiti prepoznatljiv stil u izradbi pojedinih predmeta, bili oni dovršeni ili nedovršeni. Ne tako rijetko bili su oplemenjeni i egzotičnim predmetima kao što nam to sugeriraju staklene i koštane perlice ili famozne jantarne perle različitih varijanti, posebno ona tipa Tiryns i Allumiere iz otoka Krka i Paga (cat. 10-11; 22-24; 30; sl. 25; 29), koje se svojom količinskom zastupljenošću ubrajaju u sam vrh nalaza u odnosu na njihovu sveopću rasprostranjenost. Neupitno istupa i isključivo uvožena roba kao što su dijelovi pojedine vojne opreme, npr. mač tipa Allersona/Naue II iz Sužana (kat. 44, sl. 35), ili kratki mač italčkog tipa iz Gromačice (kat. 153-154, sl. 74-75), ili sjekira sa zaliscima tipa Guntramsdorf iz Grižana (kat. 173), ili čak tuljasta sjekira s ukrasnom triju kružića u rebrastom "Y" ornamentu iz Osora (kat. 98, sl. 41). Ti predmeti stoga izdvajaju pojedina mjesta u kvarnerskom ambijentu i samim time njihove korisnike kao individue koji opet,

4; 7-8; 15; 86), whereas on the western side, a special position was taken up by Nesactium itself (fig. 86).

In addition, if the attire is observed more closely and defined according to its attributes as: 1. decoration of the clothes and the body (jewelry); 2. tools as decorations and 3. military equipment,<sup>785</sup> then different statuses and relations between its owners can be observed, even on a sample as presented by the sites in the Kvarner basin. Their typological and chronological background for analyzing and interpreting the finds, culturally and historically, is mainly based on the observation of clothes and body decorations, mostly pins, fibulae and pendants (fig. 40; 87-88). They clearly point at the presence of an elaborated system of meanings and symbols, of the original and unique as opposed to the imported and international (fig. 18; 22; 34; 38-39; 44-45; 47; 64; 67; 70; 72-73; 82). Of course, what has to be kept in mind is that marginal areas were under constant influences or intensive infiltrations of elements from neighbouring cultural groups, as clearly demonstrated by the finds from Kvarner in their spatial relations stretching from north to south and from east to west. In fact, those influences can be observed in the Bronze and Iron Ages in the distribution of local finds as well as in the acceptance of artifacts of international character (fig. 18; 22; 31; 35; 38-39; 44-45; 46; 60; 63; 66; 69; 76; 81). Therefore, the presence of continental influences deriving from the Urnfield culture, Japodian or Notranjska with Škocjan-Karst cultural groups can be observed in the northern part of Kvarner and Podvelebit, whereas Liburnian influences are stronger on the islands of Pag and Rab, and Italic and Histrian influences are present on the territory of the islands of Cres and Lošinj.

When observed in a long chronological perspective and according to

<sup>783</sup> Binford 1989: 106-109.

<sup>784</sup> Bradley 1998: 36-42, 135-150; Gosden, Marschall 1999.

<sup>785</sup> Barrett 1989: 314.

na taj način, reprezentiraju svoju užu i širu zajednicu u kulturnoj mreži značenja. Kvantitetom i različitosti takvih predmeta izdvajaju se za sada područje Rijeke, s gravitiranim Kastvom i Bakrom, područje Krka i Baške, s gravitiranim crkveničkim i senjskim prostorom, odnosno područje Osora s otočnom skupinom (sl. 2; 4; 7-8; 15; 86). Na zapadnoj strani specifičnu poziciju pridobio je pećinski sustav na obroncima Učke, dok je posebnu ulogu protourbanog središta južnije, igrao sam Nezakcij (sl. 86).

Nadalje, ako od svih tih predmeta pobliže sagledavamo nošnju i definiramo je njezinim atributima kao: 1. ukrasa odjeće i tijela (nakit), 2. alata kao dekoracije te 3. vojne opreme,<sup>785</sup> tada nam ona pokazuje različite statuse i odnose između njihovih nositelja, tj. imatelja, pa čak i na uzorku kakvog su pružila nalazišta kvarnerskog bazena. Tipološki i kronološki oslonac analiziranja i kulturno-povijesnog interpretiranja građe upravo predstavlja atribut ukrasa odjeće i tijela, ponajviše igala, fibula i privjesaka (sl. 40; 87-88). Oni nam izričito ukazuju na tako izgrađeni značenjski i simbolički sistem; samosvojno i jedinstveno, naspram importiranog i nadregionalnog (sl. 18; 22; 34; 38-39; 44-45; 47; 64; 67; 70; 72-73; 82). Naravno, pri tomu uvijek treba imati na umu kako su rubna područja bila pod utjecajima, odnosno intenzivnijim prožimanjima sa susjednim kulturnim skupinama, što je kvarnerska građa u odnosu sjever-jug, istok-zapad sasvim decidirano pokazala, bilo u kasnom brončanom dobu, bilo tijekom početnog željeznog doba (sl. 18; 22; 31; 35; 38-39; 44-45; 46; 60; 63; 66; 69; 76; 81). Zbog toga je sve izrazitija prisutnost kontinentalnih utjecaja ili realnih elemenata KPŽ, zatim japodske ili notranjske i škocjansko-kraške skupine na sjevernom dijelu Kvarnera i Podvelebita, odnosno liburnske na otoku Pagu i Rabu, te posebno italskih i istarske na području Cresa-Lošinja.

No rasporedom u vremenskoj distanci, a sukladno nadregionalnim i regionalnim kriterijima njihova vrednovanja, tipološki klasificirane igle i fibule svjedoče o razvojnom kontinuitetu i povezanosti zajednica na Kvarneru, kao i o brojnim nesuglasjima koje takva sinkrona i diakrona perspektiva kreira (sl. 42; 46; 69; 87-88). Zbog toga se čini malo vjerojatnim da je Kvarner ikada bio integralnim dijelom liburnske skupine, što je pokušaj izdvajanja tzv. *podvelebitske grupe kasnog brončanog doba*<sup>786</sup> iz ostalog dijela Liburnije već suptilno i logično ispostavio. To svakako ne znači da se u pojedinim političko-privrednim okolnostima otočni dio Kvarnera nije mogao naći pod nominalnom kontrolom Liburna, upravo kao što je i priobalni dio mogao biti u određenim razmjerima pod vlašću Japoda.

Potom, alatke kao ukrasi ili sastavni dio nošnje iznimno su rijetka pojava na kvarnerskim nalazištima. Izdvajaju se jedino ulomci britve iz Garice (kat. 168) koji, nažalost, ne omogućuju izrazitiju daljnju raspravu. Nešto bolju perspektivu pružio je pak nalaz pincete s Krka (kat. 19), iako je i na tom primjerku analiza ostala ograničena na tipološko-kronološku interpretaciju.

I konačno, vojna je oprema znatno brojnije zastupljena, kako u odnosu na drugu građu tako i u odnosu na starije studijske sinteze toga područja. Uz određene kontekste njihova nalaženja u vremenskom slijedu pojavljivanja, pruža stoga mogućnost interpretacije i reinterpretacije pri analiziranju formativnih procesa struktura i statusa određenih grupacija.

Na to posebno upozoravaju nalazi mačeva iz Sužana, Kastva i Grižana te Gromačice (sl. 37; 78; 89; T. 2: 172; T. 4: 177-178), a po

regional and international evaluation criteria, the typologically classified pins and fibulae show evolutionary continuity and the connection of communities inhabiting the Kvarner, but also numerous discrepancies caused by such a synchronous and dyachronous perspective (fig. 42; 46; 69; 87-88). Consequently, it appears less likely that Kvarner was ever an integral part of the Liburnian group, as was already suggested in a subtle and logical way in the attempt of singling out the *Podvelebit group of the Late Bronze Age* from the rest of Liburnia.<sup>786</sup> However, this does not mean that, in specific political or economic circumstances, the Kvarner islands could not have found themselves under the nominal control of the Liburni, as the coastal belt could have been to a certain extent under the control of the Japodians.

In addition, the tools as decoration or integral parts of attire were extremely rare on Kvarner sites. Only the fragments of a razor from Garica (cat. 168) can be singled out, which, unfortunately, do not allow any further discussion. The discovery of tweezers from Krk (cat. 19) might have a better perspective, although the discussion about this find remained limited to the typological and chronological interpretation.

Finally, the military equipment is more numerous represented – in relation to other finds as well as in relation to previous syntheses of this territory. Due to specific contexts of discovery in the chronological sequence of their appearance, these finds allow the interpretation and re-interpretation of formative processes of structures and statuses of specific formations. This is especially true of the discoveries of the swords from Sužan, Kastav, Grižane and from Gromačica (fig. 36-37; 78; 88; T. 2: 172; T. 4: 177-178), as well as the axes and spear points (fig. 41; 54; T. 2: 173). These items were not necessarily linked to the existence of a warriors/military stratum of society or aristocracy, since we know that the *sword does not necessarily mark a soldier, but a soldier can carry a sword*,<sup>787</sup> and understanding their individual types as an international manifestation of accepted trends. In fact, it was this type of artifact that could have been manufactured and used as a gift, in the so-called exchange of gifts, and/or as a special emblem with a symbolic value, they were mostly singled out in the ritual praxis of intention, whereas the way and purpose of their deposition<sup>788</sup> is not necessarily immanent only to depots.<sup>789</sup> That is why the swords from Sužan, Kastav and Gromačica stand out – all of them were discovered in graves and all of them were intentionally (ritually) damaged, broken, bent or fragmented. In the same manner we can recognize a specific ritual on the fragment of a flame shaped spear point from Oporovina cave, as well as the sword from Grižane which, rammed into the bedrock in a special natural environment, suggests the accepted and used *ex voto* or *katharsis* concepts. Not even in this case can Nesactium be avoided, where the intentional fragmentation of military equipment, attire, jewelry and other prestigious items can be observed.

Rationally, we are aware of the fact that the connection between material finds, goods, and the functional necessity of the social system is causal. The relation between people and artifacts in the reproduction cycle renews both the relations between people and those between artifacts, and therefore, the impact of people on artifacts is equal to the impact between people themselves.<sup>790</sup> When conceiving the presented extremely reduced symbols of these causal processes of human activity on the Kvarner region in this way, they provide a possible way how to look at past societies. As shown above, this region functions as a logon with an island archipelago which is deeply dragged into the European

<sup>785</sup> Barrett 1989: 314.

<sup>786</sup> Majnarić-Pandžić 1998: 160.

<sup>786</sup> Majnarić-Pandžić 1998: 160.

<sup>787</sup> Barrett 1989: 314.

<sup>788</sup> Bradley 1998: 80-85; Budd, Taylor 1995: 138-141.

<sup>789</sup> Hansen 1994; Teržan (ed.) 1996.

<sup>790</sup> Barrett 1989: 306-307; Godelier 1999: 10-15; Sahlins 1999: 227-284; Gosden, Marshall 1999: 172-177.



Slika 88. Kronološka tabela zastupljenih igala na Kvarneru.

Figure 88. Chronological table of pins present on the territory of Kvarner.

strani ne smiju ostati niti sjekire ili vrhovi koplja (sl. 41; 55; T. 2: 173). Mačevi svakako nisu neophodno povezani uz postojanje vojničkog/ratničkog sloja ili aristokracije, ako znamo da *mač ne obilježava isključivo ratnika, ali ratnik može nositi mač*,<sup>787</sup> i ako pojedine njihove tipove razumijevamo kao nadregionalnu pojavu prihvaćenog trenda. Budući da su se upravo ti predmeti mogli proizvoditi i koristiti za dar, u tzv. razmjeni darova, i/ili kao poseban amblem simboličkog naboja, najčešće se izdvajaju u ritualnoj praksi namjerne, načina i svrhe njihova deponiranja koju mi opažamo,<sup>788</sup> a koja nije nužno imanentna samo ostavama.<sup>789</sup> Zato primjerom istupaju upravo mačevi iz Sužana, Kastva i Gromačice kao grobni prilozima svi namjerno (ritualizirano) oštećeni; polomljeni, savijani ili fragmentirani. Jednako tako, poseban se obred prepoznaje na ulomku vrha koplja plamenastog tipa iz Oporovine te na maču iz Grižana koji, pribijani u matične stijene posebnog prirodnog ambijenta, sugeriraju na prihvaćene i primjenjivane *ex voto* ili *katharsis* koncepte. Ni u ovome slučaju ne možemo ne prisjetiti se srodnih nalaza iz Nezakcija, gdje se predstavlja mnoštvo namjerno fragmentirane vojne opreme, nošnje, nakita i drugih prestižem obilježenih predmeta.

Racionalnim poimanjem znamo da je veza između materijalnih nalaza, tj. dobara, i funkcionalne nužnosti društvenog sustava uzročna. Odnos ljudi i predmeta u krugu reprodukcije obnavlja oba odnosa, i ona između ljudi i ona između stvari, pa je stoga

continent (fig. 1-2). The easiest passes towards the northern Alpine area are here and avail of numerous resources and goods. However, also passes towards the Italian and Pannonian territory are the lowest ones here, offering the quickest crossing. Groups of islands mutually connected by short navigable distances, are linked as a "bridge" offering a direct access to the open sea. On the outer navigable way, these communities were able to control communications during the pacification of circumstances and in trade, but also to preserve militarily their own integrity in their relations to the mainland – in the same way as it was ensured later by the "navigable way" of emperor Justinian *reconquista*. Beside that, on the outer side of the islands, in favorable bays with enough fresh water, supplies and wood, shelters for maritime crossings and stations – trade emporia were created. These were places of delivery, reloading and finally sale and trading, as well as places for other forms of exchange. They enabled the formation and organization of local economic and other rulers of different profiles – so called aristocrats of ruling social structures.<sup>791</sup> Societies organized in this way created different forms of inter-social "diplomatic" relations, that were based on their own wishes and obligations, which could be distinguished from the usual forms of exchange and trade based exclusively on profit.<sup>792</sup> This was mostly stimulated by the ceremonial exchange of gifts that performed specific social and ideological functions.<sup>793</sup> Hence, the exchange of gifts was not only a mere act of exchange, it changed ranging from

<sup>787</sup> Barrett 1989: 314.

<sup>788</sup> Bradley 1998: 80-85; Budd, Taylor 1995: 138-141.

<sup>789</sup> Hansen 1994; Teržan ed.1996.

<sup>791</sup> Already C. Marchesetti stated that the hill forts and tumuli on Cres were modest and falling behind the "civilization" which "flourished" in Osor. He also noted that the hill forts there had to be abandoned already in the Bronze Age (Marchesetti 1924: 137).

<sup>792</sup> Knapp 1993: 338-339.

<sup>793</sup> Mauss 1996: 9-157; Godelier 1999; Sahllins 1999.

djelovanje ljudi na predmete istovrijedno djelovanju između ljudi.<sup>790</sup> Razmišljajući na taj način, predočeni krajnje krnji simboli tih uzročno posljedičnih procesa ljudskog djelovanja na prostoru Kvarnera, ukazuju na moguće viđenje strukture društva. Naime, kako je rečeno, taj prostor se ponaša kao laguna s otočnim skupinama koja je najdublje uvučena u europsko kopno (sl. 1-2). Tu su prijelazi prema sjevernijim alpskim područjima, koji raspolažu brojnim resursima i dobrima, najlakši, kao što su i oni prema italjskom i panonskom prostoru najniži i najbrži. Otočna skupina, međusobno dobro povezana kratkim morskim pravcima, nadovezuje se kao "most" koji pruža izravan izlaz na otvoreno more. Vanjskim je plovnim putom uspijevala nadzirati morske komunikacije prilikom pacificiranih razmjena i trgovanja, ali i za militantnog očuvanja vlastitog integriteta u odnosu na kopno, baš kao što je to bilo osigurano "plovnim putom" Justinijanove rekonkviste. Osim toga, na vanjskim su stranama otoka, u povoljnim uvalama uz podosta pitke vode, prehrambenih namirnica i drva, stvarana utočišta morskih križišta ili postaja – trgovačkih emporija; mjesta dopreme, pretovara te napokon, same prodaje i trgovanja, kao i najrazličitijih oblika razmjene. Kao takva omogućila su da se ondje formiraju i organiziraju privredni i drugi lokalni moćnici, odličnici različitih profila, ratnička elita ili tzv. aristokracija vodećih društvenih struktura.<sup>791</sup> Društvo koje je doseglo takvo strukturiranje neminovno je razvijalo različite međudruštvene i međusobne "diplomatske" odnose koji su se temeljili na vlastitom htijenju baš kao i na obligaciji, i koji su se morali razlikovati od modela uobičajene razmjene i trgovanja temeljenog isključivo na dobiti.<sup>792</sup> Tomu je svakako najviše pogodovala i do nas, misli se, pridonijela ceremonijalna razmjena darova, koja je obnašala posebne sociološke i ideološke razmjere.<sup>793</sup> Razmjena darova nije, dakle, bila uobičajena i samo razmjena, ona je zahtijevala i mijenjala se od materijalnog simbola autoriteta do socijalne obligacije, a ujedno je transferirala, i tako recipročnost, optjecaja autoritativnog i obligativnog sudionika.<sup>794</sup> Možemo li i u našem primjeru dar razumijevati kao "totalnu uslugu" oslobađanja kulture, odnosno kao *razum* koji je moralnim odnosima uvjetovao prvotni način *mira*, i prosperiteta, segmentnog društva koji je bez *dara* bio brutalan i statičan?<sup>795</sup> Vjerojatno možemo, jer su tako zajednice morale balansirati između sebe od otoka do otoka, od otoka do obala, upravo kao i zajednički u odnosu na susjedne kulturne skupine do kojih su, razvidno je, upravo prema materijalnoj kulturi, održavali svoju distanciranost i svoju slobodu, *vice versa* svoje suživote i kompromise. Krhko segmentno društvo moralo je stoga u svakoj razmjeni njezinom materijalnosti utjelovljavati i *sociabilnost*.<sup>796</sup>

No i ta je razmjena na određenoj točki progresivnog razvoja kreirala moć i prestiž, koji se ostvaruju vrijednostima ne i samo produkcije, nego *za* i *u* procesima tih razmjena, pa je takva ambivalentna logika omogućila da se vrijednosti dobara i prestiž ljudi

material symbols of authority to social obligation, and, at the same time, it created the reciprocity of obligations between the persons involved.<sup>794</sup> Are we able to observe, in our case, a gift as a "total favor" liberated of cultural constraints, or as the *reason* which, with moral relations, conditioned the primordial way of *peace* and prosperity of the segmented society which would be brutal and static without the *gift*?<sup>795</sup> Most probably we can. Since these societies had to balance between themselves from an island to another, from the islands to the coast, as well as to neighboring cultural groups in relation to which, as observable in the material culture, they sustained their distance and their freedom, *vice versa* to their lives and compromises they had to meet. The fragile and segmented society had to embody the *sociability* into every exchange of material goods.<sup>796</sup>

It was this exchange that at a certain point of progressive development created power and prestige. They were created by the values and this not only based on production, but also also on the processes in, and for, that exchange. Such an ambivalent logic enabled the value of goods and the prestige of people to be formed at the same time.<sup>797</sup> Therefore, it would be right to assume that these processes caused the separation of settlements and inhabitants – beside Nesactium, the same role must have been played by Osor, Baška, and perhaps by and its vicinity (fig. 2; 15; 86), since these locations provided highly valued and precious artifacts that can be observed as metaphors of their inhabitants' authoritative and ideological concepts of life.

Entirely contrary to the (moral) exchange of gifts, deliberate consumption, especially the one practiced in ceremonies (destruction, deposition), interrupted reciprocal relations creating a primitive mode of accumulation, elaborating and accelerating the developmental phases of social stratification, which started developing in mutual behaviours. In this way, asymmetrical social relations were created, actually a hierarchisation of the reproductive society in which social strata, classes, statuses... were created.<sup>798</sup> Their recognition and ideology are the driving force of any kind of power, which is reflected in the individual rites of sacral, ritualized connotations and religious practices. The "reconstructed grave" from Baška (fig. 20) will surely show the special status of the female person that took such luxurious and recognizable jewelry into "eternity". In any case, numerous pendants from Krk and Osor should also be added (fig. 21-22; 41), as well as the decorated phalerae of the *Caput Adriae* type (cat. 96; fig. 62-63) and other jewelry coming from destroyed graves, since their semantic and symbolic value provides, although to a smaller degree, a large narrative content within in a variety of communicational systems.<sup>799</sup>

Except for such explicit ones, symbolically codified identities are expressed in the so-called ritual consumption, in the exclusion from circulation, which was often the major and decisive mechanism of power of individual "chiefdom" societies.<sup>800</sup> Therefore, connections with the deceased and with transcendental beings become even more complex, since, with the destruction of artifacts or their deposition into graves, the flow of obligatory relations, on which the journey of artifacts was based, was interrupted. In this way, the living provided on a symbolical level a status to their deceased<sup>801</sup> by means of a clearly structured burial rite, which was a replacement for the chaotic act of death with a recognizable impact; the ritual of the passage of the deceased from the structured word

<sup>790</sup> Barrett 1989: 306-307; Godelier 1999: 10-15; Sahlins 1999: 227-284; Gosden, Marshall 1999: 172-177.

<sup>791</sup> Tako već i sam C. Marchesetti kaže kako su gradine i tumuli po Cresu skromni i zaostali u odnosu na "civilizaciju" koja je "cvjetala" u Osoru, odnosno da su gradinska naselja morala biti napuštena već u brončanom dobu (Marchesetti 1924: 137).

<sup>792</sup> Knapp 1993: 338-339.

<sup>793</sup> Mauss 1996: 9-157; Godelier 1999; Sahlins 1999.

<sup>794</sup> Mauss 1996; Godelier 1999: 6, 10, 44-48; Barrett 1989: 307-308.

<sup>795</sup> *Razmjene su mirno riješeni sukobi, sukobi su rezultat neuspjelih transakcija*, kako su to vidjeli M. Mauss ili C. Lévi-Strauss, nasuprot *rata svih protiv svih* T. Hobbesa (Sahlins 1999: 220-221).

<sup>796</sup> Sahlins 1999: 216-225.

<sup>794</sup> Mauss 1996; Godelier 1999: 6, 10, 44-48; Barrett 1989: 307-308.

<sup>795</sup> *Exchange are peacefully settled conflicts, conflicts are the consequences of failed transactions*, as it was perceived by M. Mauss or C. Lévi-Strauss contrary to the *war as all against all* by T. Hobbes (Sahlins 1999: 220-221).

<sup>796</sup> Sahlins 1999: 216-225.

<sup>797</sup> Sahlins 1999: 259-264; Voutsaki 1997: 36-37.

<sup>798</sup> Barrett 1989: 308; Voutsaki 1997: 39-40.

<sup>799</sup> Comp. Kienlin 2005; Preucel 2006; Eggert 2010.

<sup>800</sup> Godelier 1999: 108-170; Voutsaki 1997: 38.

<sup>801</sup> Godelier 1999: 179-198.

izgrađuju simultano.<sup>797</sup> Stoga ne bi bilo pogrešno pretpostaviti kako su ti procesi uvjetovali izdvajanje naselja i njihovih žitelja pa pored Nezakcija, moramo računati s Osorom i, najvjerojatnije, s Baškom, možda i s Rijekom i njezinom bližom okolicom (sl. 2; 15; 86), budući da su nam prosljedili određene visokovrijedne i dragocjene predmete kao metafore njihovih autoritativnih i ideoloških koncepata stvarnoga života.

Posve suprotno od (moralne) razmjene darova, namjerna potrošnja osobito ona prakticirana u ceremonijalnim obredima (uništavanje, deponiranje), dokida recipročne odnose te uvodi i izgrađuje primitivni način akumulacije, nadograđujući i ubrzavajući razvojne faze raslojavanja koji su već bili otpočeti recipročnim ponašanjem. Na taj se način izgrađuju asimetrični društveno-privredni odnosi, zapravo hijerarhizacija reproduktivnog društva u kojem se stvaraju slojevi, klase, statusi...<sup>798</sup> Njihova spoznaja i ideologija pokretačka su snaga bilo kojeg oblika moći, a koja se zrcali u pojedinim obredima najčešće sakralnih, ritualiziranih konotacija i religioznih praksi. Ukazivat će nam tako "rekonstruirani grob" iz Baške (sl. 20) zasigurno na poseban status žene koja je takav bogat i prepoznavani nakit prosljedila u "vječnost". Pridružiti im se svakako trebaju i brojni privjesci iz Krka i Osora (sl. 21-22; 41), ukrašene falerice tipa *Caput Adriae* (kat. 96; sl. 63-64) i drugi sitan nakit koji potječe iz uništenih grobnih cjelina, jer je njihova semantička i simbolička vrijednost, iako u malim dimenzijama, velikog narativnog sadržaja u različitim komunikacijskim sustavima bila neupitna sama po sebi.<sup>799</sup>

Izuzetno tako eksplicitnih, simboličko kodificirani identiteti, očituju se i u tzv. ritualnoj potrošnji, isključivanja iz optjecanja, koja je često bila odlučujuća i glavni mehanizam moći pojedinih "poglavarstvenih" zajednica.<sup>800</sup> Zbog toga povezanost s pokojnicima i transcendentalnim bićima postaje još kompleksnije naravi, jer se uništenim predmetima ili predmetima položenim u grob tijekom obligacijskih razmjera, koji se zasnivao na putovanju predmeta, prekida. Time živi svojim pokojnicima simbolično izgrađuju status,<sup>801</sup> s jasno strukturiranim pogrebnim ritualom, koji je zapravo postao zamjena za kaotično djelovanje smrti s prepoznavajućim djelovanjem; ritual prijelaza pokojnika iz strukturiranog svijeta živih u svijet mrtvih se završava s nasilnim uništavanjem (deformiranjem, fragmentiranjem, paljenjem na lomači).<sup>802</sup> Iznimno zanimljivi i upadljivi su stoga mačevi iz Kastva i Gromačice, koji su namjerno i nasilno fragmentirani i to tako da je mač iz Kastva polomljen na tri gotovo jednaka dijela ali je kao cjelina postavljen u grob. S druge strane maču iz Gromačice nasilno je odvojen samo balčak, a oštrica sakaćena, dok su ostali dijelovi mača i korica, uz iglu, pohranjeni s pokojnikom. Tragovi ritualnog sakaćenja vidljivi su potom i kod grobnih priloga iz Stolniča, Sužana kao i za većinu građe koja vremenski pripada kasnom brončanom dobu (nakitne garniture iz nekropola Garice, Osora ili Novalje) (sl. 23; 41; T. 1),<sup>803</sup> pri čemu se ističu izričito deformirane fibule kvarnerske varijante sa dva dugmeta na luku iz Osora (sl. 41: 55-56).

Navedeni nam primjeri još jednom potvrđuju tezu po kojoj su namjerno fragmentirani veliki i dragocjeni predmeti, simboli vlasti ili autoriteta, čije se uništavanje i deponiranje, barem dijela pred-

of the living into the world of the dead ends with violent destruction (deformation, fragmentation, burning at the stake...).<sup>802</sup> Therefore, particularly interesting and outstanding are the swords from Kastav and Gromačica, which were intentionally and violently fragmented – the example from Kastav is broken into three almost identical parts, but was positioned as a whole into the grave. On the other side, the sword from Gromačica had only its terminal removed, the blade mutilated, whereas the other parts and the sheath, together with the pin, were deposited into the grave together with the deceased. These traces of ritual mutilation are visible also in the grave goods from Stolnič, Sužan and in the majority of finds which were attributed to the Late Bronze Age (jewelry from the necropoles of Garica, Osor or Novalja) (fig. 19; 23; 41; T. 1),<sup>803</sup> where the markedly deformed bow fibulae of the Kvarner variant with two knobs on the bow from Osor must be pointed out (fig. 41: 55-56).

These examples confirm once again the thesis according to which large and valuable artifacts were intentionally fragmented. They were symbols of power and authority whose destruction and deposition, at least of some part of them, were ascribed to the well-designed performance of participants in burial rites. Even if the artifacts were ritually destroyed, parts of them were included into the world of the living. The worlds of the living and of the dead were connected through fragmentation and the ritual distribution of these artifacts.

A third, frequent social practice may be joined to the latter, i.e. the accumulation of valuable goods or actually the deposition of old artifacts as part of a burial rite.<sup>804</sup> Perhaps the individual finds from Nesactium or the necropoles in Škocjan could be observed from that perspective?!

The symbols and their concepts, and especially the ritualization and sacrifice of artifacts of exclusively high and metaphorical value, point at the differences in their initial consecration – differences between their practitioners, not only in the afterlife but also in all other forms of social and religious practices.<sup>805</sup> Consequently, it is well argued that the luxurious jewelry items, phalerae, beads and pendants mainly indicate female status features and principles, whereas deformed and segmented military attire bears whiteness to the male position and activities within society. Even though this may not be the final claim, in both cases the knowledge and understanding of ceremonial executors and different traditions are reflected at the same time – as demonstrated by the swords from Sužan, as opposed to the ones from Kastav and Grižane. In these cases, of course, an important role was played by the chosen locality for individual activities – especially for the deposition.<sup>806</sup> As a particular case the sword from Grižane should be mentioned, which was deposited as an individual artifact rammed into the rock outside the settlement, of course, at the closest mountain pass. According to certain interpretations, it could be perceived as a form of purification rite or offering. Also the sword from Lokvina in Kastav could be added here, if interpreted as an exceptional sacralised object deposited on the territory of the lower city, beside the entry on to the highest plateau of the settlement considered to be functioning as the acropolis. Numerous other artifacts could be most probably interpreted, if detailed information about their contexts of discovery were preserved and this based on the specific place of their deposition. Although the possibilities are currently limited, one should also focus on the different aspects

<sup>797</sup> Sahlins 1999: 259-264; Voutsaki 1997: 36-37.

<sup>798</sup> Barrett 1989: 308; Voutsaki 1997: 39-40.

<sup>799</sup> Usp. Kienlin 2005; Preucel 2006; Eggert 2010.

<sup>800</sup> Godelier 1999: 108-170; Voutsaki 1997: 38.

<sup>801</sup> Godelier 1999: 179-198.

<sup>802</sup> Nebelsick 1997: 37-38; Nebelsick 2000: 167; usp. Tarlea 2008.

<sup>803</sup> Pri tome je također važno ponovno naglasiti kako su nakitne garniture iz Šule sačuvane u cijelosti.


<sup>802</sup> Nebelsick 1997: 37-38; Nebelsick 2000: 167; comp. Tarlea 2008.

<sup>803</sup> We have to note that the jewelry sets from Šula are preserved whole.

<sup>804</sup> Guggisberg 2004: 187.

<sup>805</sup> Godelier 1999; Osborne 2004.

<sup>806</sup> Bradley 1998: 97-128; Teržan 1996: 255-256; Osborne 2004: 7-8.



**Slika 89.** Rasprostranjenost brončanih tronožaca i *oxhide* ingota (nadopunjeno prema Hase 1995; Lo Schiavo 2011; Kaiser 2013).

**Figure 89.** Distribution of bronze tripods and oxhide ingots (supplemented to Hase 1995; Lo Schiavo 2011; Kaiser 2013).

meta, pripisuje osmišljenom djelovanju sudionika u posmrtnim ceremonijama. Pa iako su predmeti ritualno bili uništeni, cjeline rastavljene, dijelovi su, međutim, ostali uključeni u svijet živih. Tako se preko fragmentacije, a kroz ritual razdjele povezivao svijet živih i svijet mrtvih.

Njima možemo pridodati i treću, nerijetko, obavljanu društvenu praksu, kojom se uobičavalo akumulirati vrijednosna dobra, odnosno primjenjivati deponiranje starijih predmeta kao dio pogrebnog rituala,<sup>804</sup> u čijem bismo aspektu možda mogli vidjeti pojedine nalaze iz Nezakcija i škocjanskih nekropola!

Simboli i njihovi koncepti sami po sebi, a ritualiziranja i žrtvovanja predmeta isključivo dragocjenih i metaforičkih vrijednosti, upućuju na njihovo različito izvorno posvećivanje, odnosno njihovih praktikanata ne samo u posmrtnim već i u svim drugim oblicima socio-religioznih praksi.<sup>805</sup> Argumentirano se pretpostavlja kako luksuzni nakitni elementi, falere, perle ili privjesci, najvećim dijelom, ukazuju na ženske statusne odlike i njihova počela, dok deformirana i segmentna vojna oprema svjedoči o muškoj poziciji i aktivnosti u društvu. Premda to ne može biti konačna tvrdnja, obama primjerima odražava se ujedno poznavanje i razumijevanje ceremonijalnih izvršitelja i različitih tradicija, kao što je to pokazano i u slučaju mačeva iz Sužana, nasuprot onima iz Kastva i Grižana. U tome naravno značajnu ulogu ima i mjesto odabira pojedinih djelatnosti, osobito pohrane.<sup>806</sup> Kao posve specifičan primjer valja ovdje navesti mač iz Grižana koji je ostavljen,

of use of caves which are numerous in the carstic area of Kvarner. Currently, no sites of extraordinary Late Bronze Age potential are known, as is the case of the caves in the neighboring areas such as Bezdanjča in Lika, Mušja jama in Škocjan on the Carst, or Laganiši in Istria, which were discussed earlier. However, from the total sample, as many as four caves – that of Oporovina, Podosojna, Šiljevica and Vlaška peć, provided valuable and interesting finds of material culture. In addition, it has to be mentioned that almost in all excavated caves, at least one cultural layer was identified with remains from the Late Bronze Age. At the moment, Podosojna peć stands out in terms of diversity of its ceramic inventory, but also in terms of the way and kind of use of the very cave, which was generally interpreted to be of exceptional symbolical value for the populations from those periods.<sup>807</sup>

In any case, an exclusively typological, i.e. stylistic analysis of the artifacts does not mean at the same time their production on a specific locality by using local materials from closer or more distant areas, or maybe products or pseudo-products obtained by recycling. In fact, chemical analyses of numerous metal samples from Sardinia demonstrated that the used artifacts were produced from local raw materials on the localities themselves, whereas oxide ingots were imported exclusively from Cyprus (Apliki-Skouriotissa), since they were considered to be a recognizable feature of that island.<sup>808</sup> The same applies to the northern Adriatic where, beside the Cypriote imports from the famous Frattesina (iron knives),<sup>809</sup> also the finds from the eastern part of *Caput Adriae* and the south-eastern Alpine

<sup>804</sup> Guggisberg 2004: 187.

<sup>805</sup> Godelier 1999; Osborne 2004.

<sup>806</sup> Bradley 1998: 97-128; Teržan 1996: 255-256; Osborne 2004: 7-8.

<sup>807</sup> Harding 2000: 317-320; Harding 2005.

<sup>808</sup> Stos-Gale 2000: 60-61; Sherratt 2000: 87; comp. Lo Schiavo et al. 2009.

<sup>809</sup> Sherratt 2000: 87, f.n. 18; Pearce 2000.

pojedinačni predmet zabijen u matičnu stijenu izvan naselja, naravno, uz najbliži prijevoj. Sukladno pojedinim interpretacijama možda ga možemo razumijevati u nekom od obreda očišćenja ili zavjetnoga dara. Participirat će ovdje iznova i mač iz groba na kastavskoj Lokvini, ako ga tumačimo u iznimnoj sakralizaciji predmeta na položaju donjega grada, pored ulaza na najviši gradinski podiji, shvaćan kao akropola. Preciznijim poznavanjem konteksta nalaženja vjerojatno bismo još podosta predmeta iz kvarnerskih nalazišta mogli tumačiti s obzirom na odabir specifičnoga mješta pohrane. Kako je to u ovome trenutku prilično ograničena mogućnost, iz istog razloga posebnu pozornost valja usmjeriti na različite aspekte korištenja špiljskih objekata kojima kraški prostor Kvarnera obiluje. Za sada nisu poznata nalazišta iznimnog kasno-brončanodobnog potencijala, kao što je to u slučaju sa špiljama u obližnjim regijama, npr. Bezdanjače u Lici, Škocjana na Krasu ili Laganiša u Istri o kojima je bilo rasprave. Međutim, od ukupnog uzorka, čak iz četiri špilje, Oporovine, Podosojne, Šiljevice, pa i Vlaške peći, potječu vrlo zanimljivi i vrijedni nalazi materijalne kulture, a u gotovo je svim istraživanim špiljskim objektima regije dokumentiran barem jedan sloj iz kasnog brončanog doba. Podosojna peć ističe se u ovome trenutku bogatstvom svojeg keramičkog repertoara, ali upravo i načinom i tipom korištenja samog špiljskog objekta, što je općenito interpretirano simboličkim značenjem izuzetne vrijednosti populacija toga razdoblja.<sup>807</sup>

U svakom pogledu, isključivo tipološka, tj. stilska analiza predmeta ne znači ujedno i njihovu proizvodnju na određenom prostoru i to korištenjem izvornih materijala iz bližeg ili daljnjeg područja, ili možda recikliranjem dobavljenog poluproizvoda ili proizvoda. Tako su npr. geokemijske studije brojnih metalnih uzoraka sa Sardinije pokazale da su se uporabni predmeti proizvodili od lokalne sirovine i na mjesnim područjima, dok su se *oxhide* ingoti isključivo uvozili s Cipra (Apliki-Skouriotissa), čiji su, uostalom, i prepoznani produkcijski znak, tj. obilježje.<sup>808</sup> Isto vrijedi i za sjeverni Jadran gdje valja, osim tzv. "ciparskih importa" iz čuvene Frattesine (željezni noževi),<sup>809</sup> a kako bismo zaokružili poznavanje tog fenomena, pridružiti i nalaze iz istočnog dijela *Caput Adriae* i jugoistočnog alpskog prostora. Pogotovo se tu misli na nalaze iz Škocjana i ostave Udje (sl. 89),<sup>810</sup> a u čijem bismo okruženju, ako je vjerodostojan, možda mogli vidjeti i tzv. ciparski skifos iz Rijeke (?!) (sl. 67: 2). Oni, kako je poznato, nisu imali uporabnu vrijednost za njihove korisnike i njihovo akumuliranje. Namijenjena im je bila u prvome redu statusna, tj. simbolička vrijednost, iako ne nužno materijalna,<sup>811</sup> čije se obilježje odražavalo u mjestu i načinu depoziranja. Nasuprot tomu, lučne fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku ili polumjesečaste fibule ukazuju upravo na regionalnu produkciju

area must be added, if we want to understand the phenomenon. In particular, we have to bear in mind the finds from Škocjan and the depot from Udje (fig. 89).<sup>810</sup> Both of them form a context within which the so called Cypriote skyphos from Rijeka might be observed (?!) (fig. 67: 2). The mentioned finds, as already known, had no economic value for their users and their accumulation, but rather a symbolical, status-related value, although not necessarily material,<sup>811</sup> whose characteristics were reflected in their places and modes of deposition. On the contrary, the bow fibulae with two knobs on the bow or crescent fibulae indicate a local production which was physically used as applicable art, but was still ideologically recognized as an artifact of a hierarchised symbolical significance on a broader area of the Mediterranean all the way to the Levant and Asia Minor (fig. 18; 66). In this context, special attention was paid to the relations with the northern Aegean area from Macedonia to the island of Thassos, where numerous ore deposits were located and used at that time.<sup>812</sup> Therefore, the indicative element marked glass and amber beads of the Allumiere type found exactly on that island (fig. 25; 30). It is not by chance that also bow fibulae with two knobs on the bow and also crescent fibulae (fig. 18; 66) are present there, while the picture gets clearer on the territory of Macedonia with finds of different types of fibulae, pendants, bracelets and military equipment (fig. 35; 60; 63). It would be appropriate to observe the historical *Via Aegnatia*, linking the Adriatic with the territory of the northern Aegean, as a logical consequence of the development of firm foundations set up centuries earlier.

Contacts between Early Iron Age cultural groups demonstrate several new directions of political and economic affirmation and thereby of grouping.<sup>813</sup> Material finds indicate a regional principle, i.e. the interlacing of different social relations and economic processes within cultural circles that are more closely connected to each other in terms of geographical vicinity. In fact, at the beginning of the Early Iron Age the particularly mobile, so-called Adriatic cultural *koiné*, whose formation concept had already started, becomes stabilized in a more regional sense of the upper Adriatic *koiné*.<sup>814</sup> Individual items of material culture, particularly of attire and jewelry, as already seen in the discussion, were a consequence of a general trend and show the interlacing of influences and cultural elements from the southeastern Alpine area and from the Italic cultural environment, especially from its northern part via maritime or trans-alpine contacts. The essence of these ideas and of the technological progress will create the basic principle for the formation and the upheaval of the proto-urban societies and of

<sup>807</sup> Harding 2000: 317-320; Harding 2005.

<sup>808</sup> Stos-Gale 2000: 60-61; Sherratt 2000: 87; usp. Lo Schiavo et al. 2009.

<sup>809</sup> Sherratt 2000: 87, f.n. 18; Pearce 2000.

<sup>810</sup> Neobično je da S. Sherratt zaobilazi ili ne poznaje te nalaze materijalne kulture, pa je stoga pokušaj njezinog sintetičnijeg prikazivanja zapravo iskrivljen. Vidjeti o tome drugačije kod E. Borgna (1999). Naravno u toj diskusiji neupitan značaj imaju minijturni *oxhide* ingoti iz Makarske i Kloštar Ivanića (Glogović 2000: 15; Mihovilić et al. 2002: 32; Barbarić 2009: 320), kojima se pridružuju i noviji nalazi iz Peretta kod Udina (Borgna 2009; Lo Schiavo et al. 2009). U literaturi se navodni i jedan takav primjerak s otoka Paga(?) (Parović-Pešikan 1985: 26, K. 2: 2) (sl. 89). U tuzemnim su pregledima toga gradiva, doduše, često dovedeni u pitanje (npr. Forenbaher 1995: 272-274; Tomas 2005: 679-680). Razinu i vrijednost takvih relacija pogotovo će podržavati fenomen izrazito zastupljenih keramičkih tronožaca na čitavom prostoru sjevernog Jadrana (npr. Blečić Kavur 2012a).

<sup>811</sup> Npr. kao poticaj uvođenju crne metalurgije. Detaljnije o utjecajima ciparske produkcije i konstruktiva "Frattesina fenomena" vidjeti kod E. Borgna (1992; 1999; 2009).

<sup>810</sup> It is strange that S. Sherratt avoids or is not familiar with these finds which makes her attempt at a synthetic overview actually biased. See for a different perspective E. Borgna (1999). Of course in this discussion an undisputed role is played by the miniature oxide ingots from Makarska and Kloštar Ivanić (Glogović 2000: 15; Mihovilić et al. 2002: 32; Barbarić 2010: 320) to which we could add new finds from Peretto near Udine (Borgna 2009; Lo Schiavo et al. 2009). In literature there is also a remark of a probable find also from the island of Pag (?) (Parović-Pešikan 1985: 26, K. 2: 2) (fig. 89). Although they were often questioned in literature (for example Forenbaher 1995: 272-274; Tomas 2005: 679-680). The level and importance of such relations is supported by the phenomenon of numerous present ceramic tripods on the whole territory of the northern Adriatic (for example Blečić Kavur 2012a).

<sup>811</sup> For example as the impetus for introduction of black metallurgy. For a detailed explanation of the influences of Cypriote production and the construct of "Frattesina phenomenon" see E. Borgna (1992; 1999; 2009).

<sup>812</sup> Herodotus V,17, VI,46-47; Muhly 1998: 318; Stos-Gale 2000: 63.

<sup>813</sup> Tomedi 1999; Peroni 2004; Teržan 2007. It looks as if S. and A. Sherratt (1993) excludes the Adriatic and its shores from the Mediterranean marginalizing their potentials and cultural groups – and most of all their cultural achievements.

<sup>814</sup> Peroni 1996; Nascimbene 2009: 255-261.



koja se fizički koristila kao uporabni, ali je opet ideološki bila prepoznavana kao predmet hijerarhiziranog simboličkog značaja i to na širokom području Sredozemlja sve do Levanta i Male Azije (sl. 18; 66). U tom kontekstu posebnu pozornost privlači i relacija sa sjevernim egejskim područjem, od Makedonije do otoka Thasos, gdje se uostalom i nalaze brojna rudna i tada korištena ležišta.<sup>812</sup> Stoga će indikativni element obilježavati staklene i jantarne perle tipa Allumiere nađene upravo na tome otoku (sl. 25; 30). Nije slučajno da su ondje zastupljene kako lučne fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku tako upravo i polumjesečaste fibule (sl. 18; 66), dok se s prostorom Makedonije "slika izoštrava" nalazima raznih tipova fibula, privjesaka, narukvica, pa i same vojne opreme (sl. 35; 60; 63). Vrijedi stoga povijesnu *Via Egnatia*-u, u smislu mosta "Jadransjeverna Egeja", shvaćati kao logičku posljedicu razvoja već stoljećima ranije čvrsto postavljenih temelja.

Kontakti između kulturnih grupa u starijem željeznom dobu pokazuju neki novi smjer političkog i gospodarskog afirmiranja i time grupiranja.<sup>813</sup> Materijalna građa upućuje na regionalniji princip, odnosno na isprepletenost različitih društvenih odnosa i gospodarskih procesa unutar kulturnih krugova koji su zemljopisno bliže povezani. Naime, u vrijeme početka željeznoga doba stabilizira se već otpočet koncept formiranja izrazito pokretljive tzv. jadranske kulturne *koiné*,<sup>814</sup> u regionalnijem smislu gornjojadranske *koiné*. Važno obilježje na Kvarneru bio je i ritual pokopavanja. Napokon, prevladao je onaj inhumacijom i to na dva načina; u ispruženom i u zgrčenom položaju. Pojedini predmeti materijalne kulture, kako smo vidjeli u raspravi, a koji su posljedica sveopćeg trenda, pokazuju upravo prožimanje utjecaja i kulturnih dotoka nastavljenih iz kontinentalnih dijelova jugoistočnog alpskog prostora i iz italčkog kulturnog miljea, posebno njegovog sjevernog dijela, bilo prekomorskim bilo prekoalpskim kontaktima. Taj će sukus ideja i tehnološkog napretka ostvariti temeljni princip za formiranje i podizanje protourbanog društva upravo i kvarnerske regije. Određeni predmeti kronološki obilježavaju kraj jedne i početak nove velike epohe, evoluciju starih tradicija u nove forme koje tako neizravno postaju zapravo glasnicima novoga vremena. Kulturološke promjene, koje su opće i znatne, odražavaju se u demografskim i populacijskim raslojavanjima u progresivnom razvoju, novim ideološkim, sociološkim, gospodarskim i drugim zaokretima, ali koji izrastaju u kontinuitetu iz postojećih navika kasnog brončanog doba i tako stvaraju protourbano društvo, kod ponekih i etničkih obilježja. Djelić tih manifestacija može se pratiti u tipološkoj evoluciji građe i njezina značenja kao fenomena za pojedine kulturološko-sociološko-ideološke procese. Tako kasnobrončanodobnu nošnju dugog trajanja, koja se ne napušta s početkom željeznoga doba, barem dijelom predstavljaju lučne fibule raznih tipova i varijanti i jednako tako zmijaste fibule različitih tipova i inačica, koje su gustoćom i različitosti upravo na prostoru Kvarnera zabilježene u najvećoj mjeri izvan italčkog područja. Takav proces nije, dakle, slučaj samo kod italčkih nalazišta, već se kao odraz stvarnog stanja ili kao posljedica neprekinutih kontakata s italčkim kulturama pokazao i kod oblika građe iz nalazišta, poglavito nekropola, sjevernoga Jadrana. Kontakti dugih razmjera i udaljenosti nisu ugasili ili nestali, dapače u nekim se elementima još više potencira započeta "globalizacija" iz kasnobrončanog doba napose s predmetima koji imaju esencijalno simboličku vrijednost. Upravo importirani predmeti nakita, nošnje ili osobne

the Kvarner region. Specific items of material culture chronologically mark the end of one and the beginning of a new epoch, the evolution of old traditions into new forms which indirectly become the heralds of new times. Cultural changes, which are general and perceptible, are reflected in the demographic and social stratification in their progressive development, with new ideological, social, economic and other changes which sprout out continuously from existing habits of the Late Bronze Age and give birth to a proto-urban society and, in some cases, even ethnical characteristics. A part of these manifestations could be observed in the typological evolution of the material culture and its meaning as a part of the phenomena for individual cultural, social and ideological processes. The longlasting Late Bronze Age attire, abandoned at the beginning of the Iron Age, is partly characterized by the bow fibulae of different types and variants. Also the serpentine fibulae of different types and variants, discovered outside Italy on the Kvarner territory, in surprisingly high amounts and exhibiting a large degree of variability, should be included into the same category. Such a process is obviously not the case solely with Italian sites, but it was expressed as a reflection of reality or a consequence of uninterrupted contacts with Italic cultures in the forms of material culture coming from the sites, primarily necropolis, of the northern Adriatic. Long distance contacts did not cease or disappear. In fact, in several elements the "globalization", process that started in the Late Bronze Age, becomes even more intensified with items having an essentially symbolical and semantic value. Exactly the imported items of attire, weaponry and personal gear are the ones that clearly indicate the process of major change initiated at the beginning of the Iron Age.

Due to lack of raw materials, Kvarner inhabitants had to be included into the system of exchange and trade in order to obtain them. Generally, the finds presented here, observed exclusively typologically and analogically and only exceptionally with regard to their raw material, point at the uninterrupted continuity of the local metal production, to which the manufacturing and final production of amber from Osor can be nicely linked. In this way, the foundation was created for meeting one's needs and ideas, as well as for a certain competitive position in the regional circle, as nicely illustrated by the forearm bracelets, ear-rings of the Kvarner type, several types of fibulae, amber beads and many more (fig. 87-88). Therefore, the material culture is not evaluated only from the perspective of imported goods or imported ideas, exotic and luxurious artifacts,<sup>815</sup> but also within the typical local corpus of creativity and knowledge in an individualized aesthetics, which were traditionally reproduced, starting from the bow fibulae with two knobs on the bow, pins of the Šula type, probably a variant of serpentine two-partite fibulae and pins of the Velika Gorica type as well as many others (fig. 39-40; 44-45; 69; 71). This activity was exclusively antropogenuous, abstract and creative, and, most of all, decisive in relation to the natural and strategic potentials, control of communications, trade and exchange.<sup>816</sup>

<sup>812</sup> Herodot V,17, VI,46-47; Muhly 1998: 318; Stos-Gale 2000: 63.

<sup>813</sup> Tomedi 1999; Peroni 2004; Teržan 2007; S. i A. Sherratt (1993), kao da isključuju Jadran i njegove obale iz Sredozemlja, marginalizirajući njihove potencijale kao i kulturne skupine, odnosno njihova dostignuća.

<sup>814</sup> Peroni 1996; Nascimbene 2009: 255-261.

<sup>815</sup> The quantity of amber beads of the Tiryns and Allumiere type from Krk, with a number of 18 specimens, actually 19 if also Novalja is added, is not to be neglected - it should have been compared to their appearance within other contexts on the Adriatic and its hinterlands. This "picture" may be looked at from a totally different perspective, if we consider that on the sites like Debeli vrh, as well as Vrši and Privlaka only a single find was present - the same as on many other Italian sites (comp. Harding 2013: 14-17). Consequently, it is of major importance to compare Baška with the graves from Bismantova where several finds were available, especially if we observe one and the other site within the context of the expansion and meaning of the Fratessina creative/craftsmanship circle. Still, the finds of unworked amber demonstrated that sites on the islands of Kvarner, especially Osor, were not only places of exchange (Blečić 2009) but also places of their production or reshaping!

<sup>816</sup> Sherratt 2000: 88.

opreme jasno ukazuju na otpočete procese mnogih promjena koje je početak željeznoga doba u svakom pogledu sa sobom nosio.

Zbog nedostatka sirovinskog materijala, stanovništvo se Kvarnera moralo uključiti u njihovo dobavljanje sistemom razmjene i trgovanja. U presjeku, ovdje nam predstavljena građa, sagledana, dakle, isključivo tipološki i analoški, i samo iznimno sirovinski, ukazuje ipak na kontinuitet mjesne metalne produkcije na koju se sasvim lijepo nadovezuje preradba i konačna proizvodnja jantara iz Osora. Tako je stvarana osnova za mogućnost namirivanja vlastitih ideja i potreba, kao i za određenu konkurentnost u regionalnom krugu, što nam mogu pr. lijepo ilustrirati nekoliko tipova fibula ili igala, jantarna zrna i sl. (sl. 87-88). Temeljem istog, materijalna kultura ovdje nije vrednovana samo iz perspektive robe ili ideja egzotičnih ili luksuznih predmeta,<sup>815</sup> koji su se uvozili, nego i unutar samosvojnog, prepoznatljivog stvaralaštva i znanja u individualiziranju esteticizma koja su se tradicijski reproducirala počevši od lučne fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku, igala tipa Šula, vjerojatno i varijantu zmijastih dvodijelnih fibula i igala tipa Velika Gorica i dr. (sl. 39-40; 45-46; 69; 71). Ta je djelatnost isključivo antropogena, apstraktna i kreativna, a ona je, u odnosu na prirodne i strateške potencijale, kontrolu komunikacija, trgovine ili razmjene,<sup>816</sup> ipak bila odlučujuća!

Ovim "skromnim" prilogom građa iz Kvarnera podržava i rezultate novijih razmatranja, temeljem arheometalurških, kemijskih i fizikalnih analiza i sl. istraživanja, kako globalno sredozemna primjena "Dark Age" i s njime povezane reanimacijske tzv. migracionističke i tzv. kolonizatorske ideje zapravo ne postoje i kako su teorije koje operiraju s terminima potražnje i nabavke sirovina u komunikacijskim mrežama dalekih razdaljina, te s njima povezano, pristizanje novih zajednica ili cehovski povezanim metaloprerađivačima najčešće interpretiranih kao "vjetar promjena s istoka",<sup>817</sup> već odavno trebale biti napuštene u načinu interpretiranja arheoloških spoznaja ili bi trebale biti rigorozno preispitane.<sup>818</sup> J. Muhly s pravom smatra kako je izravna trgovina metalima na širokim razdaljinama zapravo iznimka a ne pravilo, potvrđujući to konkretnim studijama sirovinske građe od Španjolske pa sve do Izraela i čitave Egeje, te ponajviše nalazima iz brodoloma koji su prenosili takve terete,<sup>819</sup> a kao što smo vidjeli takvu tezu podupiru i nalazi iz Sardinije, zatim iz italjskih, balkanskih i drugih krajeva Europe<sup>820</sup> te napokon iz same Frattesine.<sup>821</sup> Možda bi tim slijedom obavijest Plinija Starijeg o dobivanju kositra na kvarnerskim otocima mogla imati neku svoju težinu,<sup>822</sup> ako ništa drugo onda u redistribucijskom smislu, kao što je i izrađivač igle tipa Velika Gorica ili pojedinih varijanti zmijastih dvodijelnih fibula mogao biti mjesni zanatlija?

<sup>815</sup> Količina jantarnih zrna tipa Tiryns i Allumiere s Krka, čiji broj od 18, tj. 19 komada s Novaljom nije zanemariv, trebala bi biti uspoređena s njihovim pojavljivanjem u ostalim kontekstima na Jadranu i njegovom zaleđu. "Slika" se može tako promatrati iz sasvim drugog aspekta ako znamo da Debeli vrh, kao i Vrsi i Privlaka broje po samo 1 primjerak, kao i brojna druga italjska nalazišta (usp. Harding 2013: 14-17). Zbog toga je upravo približavanje Baške grobovima iz Bismantove, gdje se nalazi po nekoliko primjerka, izuzetno važno pogotovo ako i jedno i drugo nalazište poimamo u ekspanziji i značaju frattesinskog obrtničko-stvaralačkog kruga. S druge strane nalazi sirovinskog jantara pokazali su da mjesta na kvarnerskim otocima, pogotovo Osoru, nisu bila samo mjesta razmjene (Blečić 2009) već i mjesta njihove prerade, odnosno obrade!

<sup>816</sup> Sherratt 2000: 88.

<sup>817</sup> Gamito 1989; Sherratt, Sherratt 1993.

<sup>818</sup> Muhly 1998: 314-324.

<sup>819</sup> Muhly 1998: 324; Muhly 2006.

<sup>820</sup> Stos-Gale 2000.

<sup>821</sup> Borgna 1992; Pearce 2000.

<sup>822</sup> Imamović 1972.

With this "humble" contribution, the finds from Kvarner also support the results of the latest considerations, which claim that, based on archaeometalurgical, chemical and physical analyses and similar investigations, the global Mediterranean application of the "Dark ages" and the related reanimation, migration and the so-called colonization ideas, actually do not exist. In addition, the theories operating with the terms of supply and demand of raw materials within the communication networks spanning over vast distances together with the related arrival of new communities or guilds connected to metal workers, and mostly interpreted as "wind of change from the East",<sup>817</sup> should have been abandoned a long time ago as a method of interpretation of archaeological cognitions, or should have been rigorously questioned.<sup>818</sup> James Muhly rightly thinks that direct long distance trade with metals was actually an exception and not a rule, substantiating these claims with studies of raw materials on the territory stretching from Spain to Israel and to the whole Aegean - mainly based on finds from ships wrecks that transported such cargo.<sup>819</sup> This thesis is supported also by finds from Sardinia, as well as from the Italic and Balkan regions and other parts of Europe,<sup>820</sup> and finally from Frattesina itself.<sup>821</sup> Within this framework also the note by Pliny the Elder concerning the processing of tin on the Kvarner islands could have some value,<sup>822</sup> at least in terms of redistribution, as does the fact that the manufacturer of the pin of the Velika Gorica type and of several variants of serpentine fibulae could have been a local craftsman?

Finds of material culture structured in this way confirm a more or less equal collaboration within a similar or even the same symbolical and ideological system, which maintained the cultural-political-economic societies in which anything, as always, had its value and, finally, its price. Interpreted in the form of data, these finds clearly testify the formation and existence of specialized social structures, that had been authoritative and powerful, that gave and received, and that were recognized as such by other cultural groups. In that way, they do not support the opposite thesis about the societies that inhabited the dismembered coasts of the eastern Adriatic in that period.<sup>823</sup> It was the upper Adriatic with its integral part, the Kvarner, that acted and created as a regional *koiné*, that was closely linked and constantly active between the holders of different cultural circles. These were primarily processes functioning across short distances, which were included indirectly and in stages, into a broader network of production, circulation and consumption of a superregional character, and also of the *koiné*, which relevantly fits into the practiced trade networks.<sup>824</sup> At the same time, the inhabitants constantly preserved their identity in the classical sense of reproducing complex communicative and cognitive norms and social relations - and these items, as we have seen, could be nicely recognized from the finds which circulated in Kvarner at the end of the prehistoric millennia (fig. 87). The value of this fact should be affirmatively pointed out once again considering the enviable amount of metal finds, regardless of the relatively poor state of archaeological research in the region, especially in recent times.

In line with the aforementioned, the typological classification of the presented finds, besides their classification within spatial and social

<sup>817</sup> Gamito 1989; Sherratt, Sherratt 1993.

<sup>818</sup> Muhly 1998: 314-324.

<sup>819</sup> Muhly 1998: 324; Muhly 2006.

<sup>820</sup> Stos-Gale 2000.

<sup>821</sup> Borgna 1992; Pearce 2000.

<sup>822</sup> Imamović 1972.

<sup>823</sup> Forenbaher 1995: 276; Barbarić 2010: 318.

<sup>824</sup> Renfrew, Bahn 2004: 374-376.

Na taj način strukturirani nalazi materijalne kulture potvrđuju manje ili više ravnopravno sudjelovanje unutar sličnog ili čak istog značenjsko-simboličko-ideološkog sustava koji je održavao kulturno-političko-privredne zajednice u kojima je sve imalo, kao i uvijek, svoju vrijednost pa napokon i svoju cijenu. Iščitavani u obliku podataka, ti nam nalazi sasvim jasno svjedoče o formiranim i specijaliziranim društvenim strukturama koje su bile i autoritativne i snažne, koje su primale i davale, i koje su, dakle, bile prepoznavaone u širim kulturnim skupinama. Time ne podržavaju suprotnu misao o zajednicama koje su u tome vremenu baštinile područje razvedenih obala istočnoga Jadrana.<sup>823</sup> Naime, gornji je Jadran, s integralnim područjem Kvarnera, djelovao i stvarao kao regionalna *koiné*, koja je bila čvrsto povezana i neprekidno djelatna između nositelja svojih kulturnih krugova. Ponajprije su se između njih odvijali procesi, dakle na kraćim relacijama, koji su se posredno, etapno, uključivali u široku mrežu proizvodnje, cirkuliranja i potrošnje nadregionalnog karaktera, pa ako hoćemo i *koiné*, koja se tako relevantno uklapa u prakticirane modele trgovinskih mreža.<sup>824</sup> Pritom su uvijek i stalno zadržavali svoju prepoznatljivost u klasičnom smislu reproduciranja kompleksnih komunikativnih i kognitivnih normi i društvenih odnosa, a te se postavke, kako se pokazalo, sasvim lijepo mogu iščitati iz građe koja je na Kvarneru kolala na prijelazu posljednjih prapovijesnih milenija (sl. 87). Vrijednost te činjenice treba iznova biti pozitivno naglašena odnosom zavidne količine metalnih predmeta na vrlo slabu, osobito modernu, arheološku istraženost cijele regije.

Prema navedenom, tipološka je klasifikacija predstavljene građe, osim smještanja u prostorne i društvene spoznajne okvire, omogućila i stvaranje relativne kronološke determinacije. Poput svih korištenih analogija i relativno kronološki odnosi uspostavljeni su u odnosu na one prostore s kojima se područje Kvarnera najviše dodirivalo prilikom nadregionalnih i regionalnih relacija. U prvome redu to se odnosi na kronologiju kontinentalne Europe, koja se neprestano usavršava primjenom radiokarbonskih i dendrokronološko korigiranih datuma.<sup>825</sup> Pridružene su joj novije periodizacije za istarsku i japodsku kulturnu skupinu,<sup>826</sup> uz novi prijedlog kronološke podjele za Liburne (sl. 90). Dosadašnja različita viđenja razvoja liburnske kulture prikazani su i u odnosu na kronologije sjeverno i srednjotalskih kultura, posebice nasuprotnih Picena<sup>827</sup> (sl. 90).

Iako je predmetno područje konvencionalno tretirano u sklopu liburnske kulturne skupine, stoga i u istoj kronološkoj shemi,<sup>828</sup> ne tako davno učinjeno je "povijesno" odstupanje od tog pasivno prihvaćenog modela. Naime, N. Majnarić Pandžić Kvarner je u vremenskom vrednovanju približila Istri i tako usmjerila pozornost na razumijevanje materijalne građe s toga prostora u nešto višoj, odnosno preciznijoj kronološkoj shemi kakva je bila razrađena za Istru.<sup>829</sup> Naprotiv, C. F. E. Pare prostor je čitavog istočnojadranskog bazena, pa tako i Kvarnera, tretirao kao zemljopisno područje "Dalmacija" i to upravo u odnosu na kronologije Š. Batovića za matični prostor Liburna.<sup>830</sup> Ocjenjivanje pojedine građe regionalnog i nadregionalnog

cognitive frameworks, allowed also the creation of their relative chronological determination. Like with all analogies used, also the relative chronological relations were created with respect to those territories that had most intensive contacts with the Kvarner territory in the process of regional and broader relations. This concerns the chronology of continental Europe in the first place, which is being constantly improved by applying radiocarbon and dendro-chronologically corrected dates.<sup>825</sup> New periodisations of the Istrian and Japodian cultural groups have been added,<sup>826</sup> with a new proposal for the chronological division of the Liburni (fig. 90). So far, visions of the development of the Liburnian culture have been presented in relation to chronologies of the northern and central Italic cultures, in particular those of Piceni on the other side of the Adriatic (fig. 90).<sup>827</sup>

Although the discussed territory was conventionally treated within the framework of the Liburnian cultural group, and thus within the same chronological scheme,<sup>828</sup> a "historical" distinction from this passively accepted model took place not so long ago. It was in her chronological evaluation that Nives Majnarić-Pandžić brought Kvarner closer to Istria and directing the attention towards understanding the material finds from this territory on a higher and actually more precise chronological scheme than the one elaborated for Istria.<sup>829</sup> Still, C. F. E. Pare treated the whole eastern Adriatic basin and the territory of Kvarner as the geographical territory of "Dalmatia", and this exactly in relation to the chronologies by Š. Batović concerning the main area of the Liburni (fig. 90).<sup>830</sup> However, the evaluation of individual finds with regional and global features for the territory of the eastern Adriatic in synchronization with Italic cultures was not an "invention" by C. F. E. Pare. All the present chronologies were created and compared on the bases of Italic (and/or European) models, and therefore the majority of regional chronological divisions in that sense are and remained only fictitious.<sup>831</sup> In fact, in a physical sense, local finds were included into known international frameworks just because they were "created" according to model! However, different evaluations of finds and new approaches (e.g. the assumptions that individual types of fibulae did not "travel" across the Adriatic for 50 or 100 years, but via direct contacts), directly overtaken models, individual seriations, mappings, etc., showed that the so-called transitional phase in the Liburnian chronology may not be supported, and that, in a cultural sense, the Late Bronze Age was continuously turning into the Early Iron Age with the introduction of novelties as a departure from the established tradition, and this simultaneously on the broader territory of the Adriatic basin (fig. 90).<sup>832</sup>

The continuity of cultural features is both constant and mutable, so that the first and the last phases of a specific culture are actually transitional phases of adjustment. Therefore, the initially suggested chronological scheme of Liburnia, as formulated by Š. Batović in 1965 (1965) (fig. 90), appears, exclusively in its relative periodisation,

<sup>823</sup> Forenbaher 1995: 276; Barbarić 2009: 318.

<sup>824</sup> Renfrew, Bahn 2004: 374-376.

<sup>825</sup> Rychner 1996; Pare 1998; Trachsel 2004.

<sup>826</sup> Mihovilić 2013; Balen-Letunić 2004.

<sup>827</sup> De Marinis, Gambari 2005. Za preostali dio Apeninskog poluotoka korištena je periodizacija prema M. Pacciarelli (2001; 2005).

<sup>828</sup> Npr. Batović 1965; Batović 1987; Hiller 1991; Glogović 2003; Batović 2003.

<sup>829</sup> Majnarić-Pandžić 1998: 160.

<sup>830</sup> Pare 1998. Osuda nedosljednosti i površnosti kod europske sinteze prijedloga kronologije C. F. E. Parea bila bi nepravdna (vidjeti i prikaz N. Majnarić-Pandžić 2002: 341-348), budući da se u radovima domaćih istraživača nalaze još krupnije zemljopisne, terminološke i kronološke pogreške.

<sup>825</sup> Rychner 1996; Pare 1998; Trachsel 2004.

<sup>826</sup> Mihovilić 2013; Balen-Letunić 2004.

<sup>827</sup> De Marinis, Gambari 2005. For the rest of Apennine peninsula was used the periodisation of M. Pacciarelli (2001; 2005).

<sup>828</sup> E.g. Batović 1965; Batović 1987; Hiller 1991; Glogović 2003; Batović 2003.

<sup>829</sup> Majnarić-Pandžić 1998: 160.

<sup>830</sup> Pare 1998. It would be unfair to condemn the inconsistencies and superficialities in the proposed chronology by C. F. E. Pare (see also the presentation of N. Majnarić-Pandžić 2002: 341-348), since there are even greater geographical, terminological and chronological mistakes in the works of national authors.

<sup>831</sup> It was Š. Batović who used the chronological scheme of the Liburni in all proposals in the same way for the whole eastern Adriatic coast from Istria to the Dalmatian littoral (Batović 1986; Batović 1987a; Batović 1987b).

<sup>832</sup> Pare 1998.

obilježja u sinkronizaciji s italskim kulturama za područje istočnog Jadrana ipak nije "izum" C. F. E. Parea. I sve dotadašnje kronologije uspoređivane su i stvarane temeljem italskih (i/ili europskih) modela, pa je većina regionalnih kronoloških podjela u tome smislu bila i ostala samo prividna.<sup>831</sup> Naime, u fizičkom je smislu u već poznate okvire nadregionalnog karaktera pridodavana građa koja je bila lokalna, jer je "stvarana" po uzoru!? Međutim, drugačije valoriziranje predmeta i noviji pristupi, npr. da pojedini tipovi fibula nisu "putovali" preko Jadrana 50 ili 100 godina, izravni kontakti u istovjetnoj mreži znanja, izravno preuzeti modeli, precizne tipološke analize, pojedine serijacije, kartiranja itd. pokazali su da tzv. prijelazna faza kod Liburna nije održiva, već da je kasno brončano doba kontinuirano, u kulturološkom smislu, prelazilo uz uvođenje pojedinih novosti kao odstupanja od uhodane tradicije, u rano željezno doba i to simultano na području šireg jadranskog kulturnog kruga (sl. 90).<sup>832</sup>

Kontinuitet kulturnih prilika je stalan kao što je i promjenjiv, stoga su uobičajeno prva i posljednja faza neke kulture zapravo prijelazne, prilagodbene. Iz tog razloga prvotni prijedlog kronološke sheme za Liburniju, kako ju je predlagao Š. Batović (1965) (sl. 90), no isključivo u njezinoj relativnoj periodizaciji, izgledno je bio najprihvatljiviji. Valja naglasiti da je ta konstatacija važna samo što se određenja približne granice početka željeznoga doba tiče te naravno ako tzv. I. fazu razumijevamo kao kasnobrončanodobnu, a II. kao prvu fazu željeznodobne kulture Liburna. Sva ostala pitanja glede kronologija područja istočnoga Jadrana ostaju i dalje nedotaknuta i neproblematizirana, niti revidirana u novim pristupima ili prijedlozima od 1987. godine.<sup>833</sup> Sve do "Pareove kronologije" jedini pokušaj drugačijeg pristupa tom izazovu pružila je G. Hiller 1991. godine, koji je, nažalost, ostao gotovo nezapažen. Svakako je dobro ponovno naglasiti kako je njezino razumijevanje gradiva u percepciji tzv. visoke kronologije, već u to vrijeme, moralo imati poticajan učinak i za preispitivanje ustaljenih tipološko-kronoloških modela i za moderniziranje pojedinih kulturno-povijesnih teza (sl. 90). Predložena periodizacija liburnskog kulturnog prostora uvjetna je i podijeljena na kasnobrončanodobni (I) i stariježeljeznodobni segment (II), u kojima se mogu dalje razlikovati pojedine faze.<sup>834</sup> Razdoblje kasnog brončanog doba u razmaku od 300/250 godina sigurno zahtijeva precizniju podjelu koja se u ovome trenutku rasvjetljuje u tri veće faze (IA-C). Jasno, građa nadregionalnog i egzotičnog podrijetla vrednovana je u smislu ondašnjeg šireg trenda korištenja i rasprostiranja, a s obzirom na to da se najviše odražava tzv. "italski import", ili njegov odraz u stvaranju istovremenih regionalnih i mjesnih oblika, prijedlog je okvirno i sinkroniziran s onima za sjeverno i srednjoitalski prostor kasnog brončanog doba (sl. 90).<sup>835</sup>

<sup>831</sup> Tako je Š. Batović kronološku shemu Liburna primjenjivao identično u svim prijedlozima i za cijelu istočnu obalu Jadrana od Istre do južnog dalmatinskog primorja (Batović 1986; Batović 1987a; Batović 1987b).

<sup>832</sup> Pare 1998.

<sup>833</sup> Npr. Marijan 2001; Buršić-Matijašić 2007. Vidjeti komentare na prijedlog kronologije B. Marijana u recenziji D. Periše (2003). Što se pak Istre tiče, K. Mihovilić analitičnim je pristupom materijalnoj građi iz Nezakcija okvirno razlučila faze II. i III. na podfaze a i b, i tako ih uskladila s podjelom za srednju Europu HaB2-B3, Ha C1-C2 i s ljubljanskom skupinom također prema shemi S. Gabrovca iz 1987. godine (Mihovilić 2001a: Sl. 38). U novijem pristupu problemu podignula je početak IA istarske faze, ne razrađujući podrobnije problem ostalih stupnjeva toga vremena (Mihovilić 2013) (sl. 90).

<sup>834</sup> Budući da ovim istraživanjem nisu obuhvaćeni svi elementi kulture Liburna, što nije bila niti prvotna namjera, ovdje predložena periodizacija je uvjetna zbog analizirane isključivo usporedne građe obaju prostora.

<sup>835</sup> Takvu tezu još više osnažuju i potkrepljuju upravo noviji nalazi iz prostora šire zadrške regije, tj. matičnog prostora Liburna (usp. Marijanović (ed.) 2012;

the most acceptable one. However, it must be pointed out that this statement is relevant only with regard to the determination of the approximate boundary of the beginning of the Early Iron Age, and, of course, providing that the so called phase I of the Liburnian culture is perceived as Late Bronze Age phase, whereas phase II is perceived as Early Iron Age phase. All other questions concerning the chronology and chronologies of the territory of the eastern Adriatic remain further untouched and neither discussed nor revised in new approaches or proposals written since 1987.<sup>833</sup> Until the "chronology by Pare" the only attempt at a different approach to this challenge was proposed by G. Hiller in 1991, but her contribution remained almost unnoticed. Of course, it is important to point out her comprehension of the finds in the perception of the so-called high chronology which, at that time, must have had a stimulating impact both on the questioning of rigid typological and chronological models, and on the modernization of individual cultural and historical theses (fig. 90). The proposed periodization of the Liburnian territory is provisional and divided into a Late Bronze (I) and an Early Iron Age (II) segment in which further individual phases may be distinguished.<sup>834</sup> The Late Bronze Age, covering a period of 250/300 years, surely needs a more detailed division, than the three major phases it displays now (IA-C). Of course, the finds of international character and exotic origin were evaluated within the then broader trend of use and distribution, and considering the fact that "Italic imports" were mainly present, or their reflection in the creation of contemporary regional and local forms, created the need for a model to be roughly synchronized with the chronologies of the Late Bronze Age of the northern and central Italic territory (fig. 90).<sup>835</sup>

The rational acceptance of interactive and mutual communication relations between the inhabitants of the Adriatic coasts and their hinterlands, or in mutual perception of artifacts of material culture as specific symbolic and ideological objects of value perceived in the same way on the broad territory of the Adriatic basin, then, the beginning of the Early Iron Age, should be followed already in the 10<sup>th</sup> century BC, as for example in the Italic cultures<sup>836</sup> and approximately in the Histrian culture.<sup>837</sup> A decision which should have been, as suggested, followed in the regional division also for the Notranjska-Škocjan-Kras and Japodian territory in the hinterlands and the central area of the Liburnian culture, as suggested (fig. 90). With the mentioned shift, which was elaborated in the periodization of N. Majnarić-Pandžić, only for the territory of Kvarner, its clear physical and material exclusion from the territory of Liburnia was shown. Unfortunately, more detailed

<sup>833</sup> For example Marijan 2000; Buršić-Matijašić 2007. See comments about the proposed chronology of B. Marijan in the review by D. Periša (2003). Regarding Istria, K. Mihovilić with a systematic approach to the finds from Nesactium managed to generally divide phases II and III into sub-phases a and b. With this act she managed to harmonize it with the division for central Europe (Ha B2-3, Ha C1-2) and with the Ljubljana group according to the typological scheme by S. Gabrovec from 1987 (Mihovilić 2001a: fig. 38). In a recent approach to the problem she raised the beginning of the Istria IA phase but without discussing into detail the other stages (Mihovilić 2013) (fig. 90).

<sup>834</sup> Since this research did not include all the elements of the Liburnian culture, which was not intended to, the here proposed periodization is just conditional due to the analyses of exclusively those finds occurring in both regions.

<sup>835</sup> Such an assumption is further strengthened and supported by new discoveries from the territory of the broader region of Zadar, i.e. the from the central territory of the Liburni (see Marijanović (ed.) 2012; Kukoč 2009b; Kukoč 2010; Kukoč 2011 and others).

<sup>836</sup> Pare 1998; Pare 2000; Pacciarelli 2001; Pacciarelli 2005; De Marinis 2005; Trachsel 2004.

<sup>837</sup> Mihovilić 2001a; Mihovilić 2013.

pr. Kr. BC	EUROPE	ITALIA	ESTE	BOLOGNA	PICENUM	DALMACIJA	LIBURNIJA				
	Rychner 1996 Trachsel 2004	Pacciarelli 2000-2005	Trachsel 2004 Nijboer 2010	Dore 2005 De Marinis, Gambari 2005	Lollini 1976 Pare 1998	Pare 1998	Batović 1987	Hiller 1991	Batović 1965		
1200	HaA1	Bronzo recente				Kraj kasnog brončanog doba / End of the Late Bronze Age	Kasno brončano doba / Late Bronze Age	Kasno brončano doba / Late Bronze Age	I		
1150	HaA2	Bronzo finale/ Protovillanoviano								II	Rano željezno doba / Early Iron Age I A
1100	HaA2										
1000	HaB1									III	Prijelazna faza / Transitional phase
950	HaB1										
900	HaB2	Primo Ferro 1	I								
			II A								
850	HaB3			I A	I	I	I	II A	II		
			II B								

pr. Kr. BC	EUROPE	ISTRA (HISTRI)	KVARNER			SJ. / N. DALMACIJA (LIBURNI)	LIKA (JAPODI)	
	Rychner 1996 Trachsel 2004	Mihovilić 2013	Cjeline / Closed contexts	Pojedinačni nalazi / Individual finds			Balen-Letunić 2004	
1200	HaA1	IA	Grizane Podosojna peč Kastav-Crekvina Bakar-Kaštel Oporovina Stolnič Sužan Šula Baška?	Sjekira tipa Guntramsdorf Keramika Igle s okruglim, bikoničnim i čavličastim glavicama Tuljasta sjekira Lučne fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku Igle s lukovičastim glavicama Perle tipa Tiryns-Allumiere Narukvice Velike lučne fibule Obručasti privjesci Staklene perle tipa I, III Trapezasto-antropomorfn privjesci	Axe of the Guntramsdorf type Pottery Pins with circular, byconical and nail-shaped heads Socketed axe Bow fibulae with two knobs on the bow Pins with onion- shaped heads Tiryns-Allumiere beads Bracelets Large bowed fibulae Ring-shaped pendants Glass beads of I, III types Trapezoidal-anthropo- morphic pendants	Kasno brončano doba / Late Bronze Age	Bezdanjača	
1150	HaA2			Grizane-Tribalj Osor-Kavanela Senj Sv. Juraj Garica	Male lučne fibule Naočalaste fibule Zmijaste fibule Polumjesečaste fibule tipa Caput Adriae Polumjesečasta britva tipa Fontanella Pinceta Igle s vazastim/ diskastim glavicama Falere tipa I ili tipa Caput Adriae Igle tipa Sirolo Numana Obručasti privjesci	Spectacle fibulae Serpentine fibulae Crescent-shaped fibulae of Caput Adriae type Semilunate razor of Fontanella type Tweezers Pins with a vase/disc- shaped heads Phalerae of type I or Caput Adriae type Pins of Sirolo Numana type Ring-shaped pendants	IA	
1100	HaA2			Grizane-Kamenolom Kastav-Lokvina Klaćenica g. 1 Klaćenica g. 2, 3			IB	Kasno brončano doba / Late Bronze Age
1000	HaB1			Osor-Sv. Petar Gromačica g. 3 Gromačica g. 2, 5, 7 Vrbnik?			IC	
950	HaB1	IB				IC		
900	HaB2					Starije željezno doba / Early Iron Age		
						IIA	IIA	
850	HaB3	IIA					IB	

Slika 90. Pregledna kronološka tabela i kronološka tabela gradiva s Kvarnera u odnosu na kronologije susjednih kulturnih skupina.

Figure 90. General chronological table and chronological table presenting the finds from Kvarner in relation to the chronologies of neighboring cultural groups.

Racionalno prihvaćanje interaktivnih i recipročnih komunikacijskih razmjera između stanovništva obala i njihova zaleđa, u recepciji predmetne materijalne građe kao specifične simboličke i ideološke vrijednosti razumijevane istovremeno na širokom kulturnom prostoru jadranskog bazena, impostira mogućnost praćenja razvoja kasnobrončanodobne kulture Kvarnera od kraja 13. pa sve do 10. stoljeća (sl. 90). Početak kasnog brončanog doba naznačen je određenim, ali prepoznatljivim metalnim nalazima materijalne kulture

relative chronological divisions of the cultural and historical development are not possible for the time being, although in this revised approach to the problem, the finds are entirely and clearly presented in a general older and younger phase, either in autochthonous or foreign forms (fig. 90). To accomplish this step, a larger collection of data and evaluations will be necessary, mainly deriving from modern research and interpretations of settlement sites and necropolises as well as an *argumentum ad argumentum* oriented conclusions.

We could state that, in spatial and chronological relations, of several social facts, the preserved material remains bare testimony of the

nadregionalnog karaktera i keramičkim gradivom u povezanosti s kulturama kontinentalnog KPŽ. Dokumentiran sve veći broj pokopa paljevinskim načinom sahranjivanja u urnama, dodatno osnažuje tezu promjena koje su "nosioci" kasnog brončanog doba dobrim dijelom iz tog kulturnog spleta sa sobom nosili. Kraj toga i početak željeznog doba također nije moguće prikazati u oštrm potezu, ali valja biti smješten već u sredinu ili u cijelu drugu polovinu 10. stoljeća, upravo kao kod italskih prilika,<sup>836</sup> budući da od kraja kasnog brončanog doba u optjecaj dolazi sve veća količina građe iz tih kultura/civilizacija, na koje se i oslanja većina interpretacija za prostor sjevernog Jadrana u cjelini. Temeljem istog, kao i brojnim argumentima iznesenima u raspravi, podignuta je gornja granica početka kulture Histra,<sup>837</sup> što u regionalnom raščlanjivanju treba biti učinjeno za notranjsko-škocjansko-kraško i japodsko područje u zaleđu, kao i za, južniji, središnji prostor liburnske kulture kako je i predloženo (sl. 90). Ipak, spomenutim je pomakom u periodizaciji N. Majnarić Pandžić, ali samo za prostor Kvarnera to već bilo učinjeno, čime se ujedno pokazala oštra izuzetnost Kvarnera iz prostora Liburnije i u fizičkom, materijalnom smislu. Nažalost, minucioznije relativnokronološke podjele kulturno-povijesnog razvoja za sada nisu moguće, premda se ovim revidiranim pristupom problemu potpuno jasno i čisto predstavila građa koja općenito artikulira stariju i mlađu fazu, bilo u autohtonim bilo u alohtonim formama (sl. 90). Za taj će korak ipak trebati mnogo veći zbir podataka i sudova, ispred svega suvremeno istraživanih i interpretiranih naselja i nekropola, k cilju *argumentum ad argumentum* razboritih zaključaka.

Ispričana materijalna građa u prostornom i vremenskom odnosu svjedoči međutim o društvenoj činjenici, o činjenici društva koje je nedvojbeno imalo segmentni ali kompleksni karakter. Njegov je prosperitet, kontinuitet i progresivni razvoj bio primarno i formativno uvjetovan prostornim-gestrateškim položajem, koji je ujedno bio i jedan od njegovih glavnih resursa, pored onih logičkih soli, drva, obilja pitke vode i dr. Kao takva društvena je činjenica stvorila povijesnu istinu koja je, u duhu kognitivne znanosti i arheologije,<sup>838</sup> tretirana oslobođanjem zavodljivosti i pasivnosti (pisanih) povijesnih, naspram arheoloških izvora. Sve raspravljano u ovoj studiji nastojalo je zato ukazati kako prostor Kvarnera, kao zaokružena cjelina, nije bio "bijela točka" u vremenu kasnog brončanog i željeznog doba, niti "crna točka" na karti prapovijesne Europe. Prostor Kvarnera nije bio niti dio "tijela" liburnske skupine niti njezin "rubni sjeverni" dio, a koji će se uvođenjem rimskog administrativnog aparata isključivo tako stoljećima predstavljati i, što je još "bolje", arheološki na taj način tumačiti sve do kasnog brončanog doba, tj. unatrag za gotovo čitav jedan milenij! Njegovi će nam žitelji možda ostati anonimne, srodne etničke zajednice na čiju različitost, doduše, sugerira i njihovo prvo, i često, navođenje u antičkoj geografiji i literaturi. Nazivljem Apsirtidi, gdje su živjeli Apsirtejci, obilježavan je tada jedinstven otok Cres-Lošinj, Elektridi se odnosio na današnji otok Krk, dok se pod Mentorima uglavnom navodila otočna skupina Rab i Pag.<sup>839</sup> Za razliku od otočnih skupina priobalno područje nije povijesno-geografski dokumentirano, i unekoliko se razlikovalo od otočja, što su, *nota bene*, pokazali i nalazi materijalne kulture. No te su se otočne i priobalne zajednice ipak u određenome ponašale koherentno i kohezivno, pa možda iz te projekcije doista možemo govoriti o zasebnoj skupini na prostoru sjevernog Jadrana – *Kvarnerskoj skupini* kasnog brončanog i početnog starijeg željeznog doba.

facts about a society which undoubtedly had a segmented and complex character. Their prosperity, continuity and progressive development were primarily and formatively determined by the spatial and geostrategic location of the region - the geographical position, which was at the same time one of its major resources, apart from the logical resources as salt, wood and plenty of drinking water, etc. As such, the social fact created a historical truth which was treated, in the spirit of cognitive science and archaeology,<sup>838</sup> by being liberated from the seductive and passive (written) historical sources, compared to archaeological ones. Everything discussed in this research indicates that the Kvarner region as a whole was neither a "blank spot" in the period of the Late Bronze and Iron Ages, nor a "black dot" on the map of prehistoric Europe. The Kvarner territory was neither an integral part of the "body" of the Liburnian group, nor was it its "marginal northern" part, although it was to be exclusively presented as such for centuries, since the introduction of the Roman administrative apparatus, and, what is even worse, it was to be explained in archaeological terms in that way until the Late Bronze Age, i.e. back for almost a whole millennium! Its inhabitants might remain anonymous, congenial ethnical groups described in the antique literature and geography as quite heterogeneous. The joint island of Cres-Lošinj was marked at the time by denominations such as *Apsirtidi*, inhabited by the Apsirtidians, whereas the name *Elektridae* referred to today's island of Krk. The island group of Rab and Pag was normally called the *Mentoridi*.<sup>839</sup> The costal belt was not mentioned in the sources and was evidently different from the islands – as shown *nota bene* by the finds of material culture. Still, these insular and costal groups behaved coherently and cohesively and it is thus from that perspective that we can talk about a separate cultural group on the territory of the Northern Adriatic – i.e. the *Kvarner group* of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages.

<sup>836</sup> Pare 1998; Pare 2000; Pacciarelli 2001; Pacciarelli 2005; De Marinis 2005; Trachsel 2004.

<sup>837</sup> Mihovilić 2001a; Mihovilić 2013.

<sup>838</sup> Npr. Renfrew, Zubrow 1994.

<sup>839</sup> Usp. Katičić 1995.

<sup>838</sup> E.g. Renfrew, Zubrow 1994.

<sup>839</sup> Comp. Katičić 1995.



# Katalog

## Uvod u katalog

Katalog obuhvaća 230 kataloških jedinica prikupljene i najvećim dijelom predstavljene građe iz prostora Kvarnera. Kataloške jedinice redaju se kako su prikazana nalazišta na slikama i potom u zasebnom katalogu i na tablama one građe koja se nalazi pohranjena u AMZ-u. U tom dijelu kataloga nalazišta uglavnom slijede abecednim redom. Unutar skupnog nalazišta, ako postoje, razmatraju se pojedini lokaliteti i/ili zatvorene cjeline potom sporadični nalazi.

Prilikom iznošenja podataka kod svakog je lokaliteta, u većoj ili manjoj mjeri s obzirom na dostupnost, iznesen opis ili kontekst nalaženja, tj. istraživanja, odnosno bilo koji poznati podatci. Slijede kataloške jedinice čiji broj odgovara broju na predviđenoj slici ili tabli. Kataloške jedinice redaju se po pravilu priloga osobne nošnje i nakita, zatim osobne opreme, drugih utilitarnih i ukrasnih predmeta, ponajprije metala, zatim jantara i kosti te na koncu keramike. Opis svakog predmeta naveden je prema tipološki općeprihvaćenim klasifikacijama s osnovnim odlikama: materijal, stanje, opis, veličina, inventarni broj u instituciji ili naziv privatne zbirke. Završava literaturom, ako je predmet objavljen, i to onom koja o predmetu donosi njegovu reprodukciju (ilustraciju, crtež ili fotografiju) ili katalošku opisnu jedinicu.

Crteži su prikazani na tablama u mjerilu 1:2, a većih predmeta, npr. mačeva iz Kastva, Grižana i Gromačice, lučne fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku iz Grižana, igle iz Gromačice, i keramika u mjerilu 1:3. Pojedini predmeti koji nisu bili dostupni, ili su izgubljeni, ili se samo navode u literaturi, ili su sačuvani u vrlo malim ulomcima, prikazani su opisnom kataloškom jedinicom.

U katalogu, kao i u tekstu, koristio se veći broj kratica za koje se navodi:

Veličina: Deb. – debljina, Duž. – dužina, Pr. – promjer, Šir. – širina, Vis. – visina, Inv. br. – inventarni broj.

### Institucije:

AMI-Arheološki muzej Istre, Pula  
AMZ-Arheološki muzej Zagreb, Zagreb  
AMZd-Arheološki muzej Zadar, Zadar  
AZO-Arheološka zbirka Osor, Cres  
CMSA-Civici Musei di Storia ed Arte, Trieste  
CR-Kastav, Crekvina  
GMS-Gradski muzej Senj, Senj

# Catalogue

## Introduction to the Catalogue

The catalogue contains 230 units consisting of collected and mostly already presented finds from the territory of Kvarner. Units follow as sites are presented on Figures and later in a separate catalogue as well as on Tables of finds, kept in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. In this part of the catalogue the sites follow in an alphabetical order.

When presenting finds from individual sites, if they exist, finds from localities or closed contexts such as graves are presented first, followed by sporadic finds. Listing the informations on individual sites are presented, depending on the degree of accessibility of information, the descriptions or contexts of discoveries, the research itself or any other relevant data. The text is followed by the catalogue units corresponding with their numbers to the number on the figures and/or tables. Examples of personal attire and jewelry are listed, followed by personal gear, other utilitarian and decorative items. First come the metal ones, followed by those made from amber and bone, and finally comes pottery. Descriptions of each artifact are made according to typological, generally accepted classifications, presenting basic characteristics of the finds – its material, state of preservation, description and size, inventory number in the institution or title of the private collection. The unit finishes, if the find is published, with quotations of literature in which the find was depicted (illustration or photography) or its description was presented.

Illustrations are presented in the scale of 1:2, while the larger items, such as swords from Kastav, Grižane and Gromačica, bow fibula with two knobs on the bow from Grižane, pin from Gromačica and pottery are illustrated in the scale of 1:3. Individual finds, currently not accessible or lost, are only listed in the literature or as very small fragments of finds only described in the catalogue.

### Institutions:

AMI-Archaeological museum of Istria, Pula  
AMZ-Archaeological museum Zagreb, Zagreb  
AMZd-Archaeological museum Zadar, Zadar  
AZO-Archaeological collection Osor, Cres  
CMSA-Civici Musei di Storia ed Arte, Trieste  
CR-Kastav, Crekvina  
GMS-Municipal museum Senj, Senj  
HAZU-Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences, Zagreb  
KORi-Ministry of Culture of Republic of Croatia, Directorate for the Protection of Cultural Heritage, Conservation Department in Rijeka, Rijeka



HAZU-Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb  
KORi-Ministarstva kulture Republike Hrvatske, Uprava za zaštitu kulturne baštine, Konzervatorski odjel u Rijeci, Rijeka  
MC-Muzej Cres, Cres  
MGŠ-Muzej Grada Šibenika, Šibenik  
MNS-Muzej ninskih starina, Nin  
NHMW-Naturhistorisches Museum, Wien  
PPMHP-Pomorski i povijesni muzej Hrvatskog primorja Rijeka = (AO PPZ)  
Stomorica-Sakralna zbirka Stomorica, Novalja  
ZFS Košljun-Zbirka franjevačkog samostana Košljun, Košljun-Krk

## STOLNIČ

**Nalaz:** Kameni tumul, promjera 10 m, nalazio se na položaju Stolnič u zaleđu Kotora iznad Crikvenice, uz rub obronka prema Podbadnju. Devastiran je i naknadno istražen prilikom gradnje betonskih stopa za dalekovod električne energije 2003. godine. Grobna komora, dimenzija 50x40 cm, bila je pokrivena kamenom poklopnicom, dimenzija 60x55 cm, uslojena od pločastog kamena, dvoetažnog dna. Relativna dubina grobne komore iznosila je 35 do 50 cm, što je uzrokovano postavljanjem izravno na neravnu matičnu stijenu s velikom pukotinom po sredini. Grobni nalazi i prilozi bili su položeni iznad pukotine. Veća je posuda, žara, sadržavala ostatke spaljenih kostiju, ulomke keramike, pored namjerno polomljene nakitne garniture nošnje. Građa se čuva u PPMHP Rijeka.

1. Ulomak brončane lučne fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku. Sačuvan je dio luka s jednim diskastim dugmetom. Luk je okruglog presjeka, ukrašen urezanim geometrijskim motivima. Snopovi paralelnih linija formiraju metopna polja, koja su ispunjena različitim ornamentom. U prvoj metopi, sa svake strane iznad dugmeta, urezane su nasuprotno postavljene girlande. U drugoj, također sa svake strane, urezani su rombovi od kojih je svaki drugi ispunjen urezanim linijama, dok je središnje metopno polje na najvišem dijelu luka ispunjeno urezanim motivom borovih grančica. Ispod dugmeta, prema završetku luka, urezana su 2 snopa paralelnih linija, bez ispuna metopnih površina.

**Veličina:** duž. 14,47 cm; pr. luka 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19333

2. Dva ulomka narukvice manšetastog tipa ravnih krajeva. Rubnici su sa svih strana ukrašeni geometrijskim ornamentom. Uz gornji i donji rubi nalaze se tekući trokuti ispunjeni gusto urezanim linijama, a krajnja je strana ukrašena debljom cik-cak linijom ispunjenom urezanim linijama. Središnjim dijelom narukvice blago je izvučeno 12 rebara. Izgledno je da su sačuvana dva rubna kraja narukvice, namjerno polomljene.

**Veličina:** duž. većeg ulomka 4,8 cm; duž. manjeg ulomka 3,6 cm; šir. 4,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19335

3. Tri ulomka masivne brončane narukvice manšetastog tipa ravnih krajeva, namjerno polomljene i patinirane. Rubnici su sa svih strana ukrašeni geometrijskim ornamentom koji je izrazito loše očuvan, izlizan i jedva prepoznatljiv. Uz gornji i donji rub nalaze se tekući trokuti ispunjeni gusto urezanim linijama, izrazitije i bolje sačuvanih uz gornji rub, a tek vidljivi uz donji rub. Ravan kraj ukrašen je cik-cak linijom koja je također trebala biti ispunjena urezanim linijama. Središnjim dijelom narukvice blago je izvučeno 12 rebara.

**Veličina:** ukupna duž. 9 cm; šir. 5,4 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19336

MC-Museum Cres, Cres

MGŠ-Municipal Museum Šibenik, Šibenik

MNS-Museum of Nin antiquities, Nin

NHMW-Naturhistorisches Museum, Wien

PPMHP-Maritime and Historical Museum of the Croatian Littoral Rijeka = (AO PPZ)

Stomorica-Sacral collection Stomorica, Novalja

ZFS Košljun-Collection of the Franciscan Monastery Košljun, Košljun-Krk

## STOLNIČ

**Discovery:** Stone tumulus, measuring 10 in diameter, was located on the site of Stolnič in the hinterlands of Kotor above Crikvenica beside the edge of the hillside leading to Podbadanj. It was destroyed and subsequently excavated during the erection of concrete foundations for the electric mains in 2003. The vault made from stone plates, measuring 50 to 40 cm, was covered with a stone plate measuring 60 to 55 cm. It was 35 to 50 cm deep located directly on the uneven bedrock with a large crack in the middle. Grave goods were positioned above the crack. A larger ceramic vessel, the urn, positioned beside the intentionally fragmented attire, contained the remains of cremated bones and fragments of pottery. The finds are located in the PPMHP Rijeka.

1. Fragment of a bronze bow fibula with two knobs on the bow. Preserved is the part of the bow with a single disc-shaped knob. The bow has a round cross-section and is decorated with incised geometric motives. Sheaves of parallel lines form metope fields which are filled with different ornaments. In the first metope, on every side of the knob, are incised opposing garlands. In the second, also on both sides, are incised rhombs. Every second field is filled with incised lines while the metope field on the highest part of the bow is filled with incised motives of pine twigs. Below the knob, located towards the end of the bow are incised 2 sheaves of parallel lines without filled metope fields.

**Size:** length 14.47 cm; diameter of the bow 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19333

2. Two fragments of a cuff-shaped bracelet with straight ends. The edges are decorated with geometric ornaments. Beside the upper and lower edge are triangles filled with densely incised lines while the end is decorated with a thicker zigzag line filled with incised lines. On the central part of the bracelet are 12 ribs. It is evident that these are preserved end parts of an intentionally fragmented bracelet.

**Size:** length of the larger fragment 4.8 cm; length of the smaller fragment 3.6 cm; width 4.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19335

3. Three fragments of a massive bronze cuff-shaped bracelet which was intentionally fragmented. The edges are decorated with geometric motives which are badly preserved, worn and hardly visible. Beside the upper and lower edge are also continuous triangles filled with densely incised lines which are better visible along the upper edge, and hardly visible along the lower. The straight edge is decorated with a zigzag line which was also most probably filled with incised lines. On the central part of the bracelet are 12 ribs.

**Size:** total length 9 cm; width 5.4 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19336

4. Bronze pin with an onion-shaped head. The pin, completely preserved, was intentionally bent and broken in to three pieces. The head is round with a protrusion on the top. Below the head is a

4. Ukasna brončana igla s lukovičastom glavicom sačuvana je u cijelosti, namjerno savijena i prelomljena na 3 dijela. Glavica je zaobljeno profilirana s istakom na vrhu. Ispod glavice nalazi se plitko profilirano rebro. Vrat je zadebljan, kružnog presjeka i naknadno koso tordiran. Igla je blago sužena, raskovana, okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog završetka.

**Veličina:** duž. 16,8 cm; pr. glavice 1,3 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19334

5. Ulomak posude oblika šalice, cilindričnoga i blago izvijenog vrata. Kose kanelure postavljene su udesno i ukrašavaju gornji dio trbuha. Nedostaju donji dijelovi, dno i rub posude te ručka. Vjerojatno dio iste posude kao i ulomak kat. 6. Smeđa polirana keramika.

**Veličina:** duž. 8,8 cm; šir. 8,4 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Stolnič*

6. Veći ulomak posude oblika šalice, cilindričnoga i blago izvijenog vrata. Kose kanelure postavljene su u dva pravca i ukrašavaju gornji dio trbuha. Nedostaju donji dijelovi, dno i rub posude te ručka. Vjerojatno dio iste posude kao i ulomak kat. 5.

**Veličina:** duž. 16 cm; šir. 8 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Stolnič*

7. Manji ulomak gornjeg dijela trbuha posude oblika šalice? Kose kanelure postavljene su ulijevo i ukrašavaju gornji dio trbuha. Nedostaju donji dijelovi, dno i rub posude te ručka. Smeđa polirana keramika. Ulomak je nađen izvan grobne cjeline.

**Veličina:** duž. 8 cm; šir. 4 cm. Inv. br.: Muzej Grada Crikvenice *Stolnič*

8. Ulomak trbuha i blago koničnog vrata urne. Sačuvana samo jedna visoko postavljena trakasta ručka koja spaja vrat i rame posude. Rub je izvučen, lagano facetiran. Smeđa polirana keramika.

**Veličina:** duž. 13,6 cm; šir. trbuha 12 cm; šir. ruba. 8,4 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Stolnič*

**Literatura:** Starac 2004: 167-170, 183; Blečić 2009: 144, Fig. 1; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 6; Blečić Kavur 2012: Fig. 2.

## GODAČ

**Nalaz:** Kasnoantička utvrda Godač na Kotoru iznad Crikvenice, istraživana je preliminarno 2007. godine. Prilikom čišćenja urušenog kamenja i šute nađen je ulomak narukvice i alke sa zupcima. Zaštitna istraživanja na lokalitetu provodio je PPMHP Rijeka, gdje je građa i pohranjena.

9. Ulomak brončane manje narukvice, manšetastog tipa izrazito patinirane, na dijelovima korodirane. Sačuvan je ravan rubni dio sa dvije nepravilne i oštećene rupe. Rubovi završavaju s blago zaobljenim i prema van izvučenim rubnikom. Ukrašena je sa 6 plitko i neravnomjerno izvedenih rebara. Unutrašnja je strana potpuno glatka.

**Veličina:** duž. 2,6 cm; šir. 2,9 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19330

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

## KRK Baška

**Nalaz:** Sporadični predmeti prikupljeni su iskopavanjima bečke prapovijesne Komisije E. Nowotnyja 1895. godine te M. Abramića i J. Szombathya 1911.-1912. godine, kao i njima

profilirano rebro, vrat je zadebljan, kružnog presjeka i zašiljenog završetka. Ispod glavice nalazi se plitko profilirano rebro. Vrat je zadebljan, kružnog presjeka i naknadno koso tordiran. Igla je blago sužena, raskovana, okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog završetka.

**Size:** length 16.8 cm; diameter of the head 1.3 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19334

5. Fragment of a cup-shaped pot with a cylindrical and slightly everted rim. The oblique grooves running to the right decorate the upper part of the belly. The lower part, bottom, the mouth and the handle of the vessel are missing. It is most probably a fragment of the same vessel as the fragment cat. 6. Brown polished pottery.

**Size:** length 8.8 cm; width 8.4 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Stolnič*

6. A larger fragment of a cup-shaped vessel with a cylindrical and slightly everted rim. The oblique grooves are running in two directions decorating the upper part of the belly. The lower part, bottom, the mouth and the handle of the vessel are missing. It is most probably a fragment of the same vessel as the fragment cat. 5. Brown polished pottery.

**Size:** length 16 cm; width 8 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Stolnič*

7. A smaller fragment of the belly of a cup-shaped vessel? Oblique grooves running to the left side decorate the upper part of the belly. The lower part, bottom, the mouth and the handle of the vessel are missing. Brown polished pottery. The fragment was found outside burial contexts.

**Size:** length 8 cm; width 4 cm. Inv. nr.: Muzej Grada Crikvenice *Stolnič*

8. Fragment of the belly and the slightly conical neck of an urn. Preserved is only one band shaped handle linking the shoulder and the neck of the vessel. The mouth is everted and slightly faceted. Brown polished pottery.

**Size:** height 13.6 cm; width of the belly 12 cm; width of the mouth 8.4 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Stolnič*

**Literature:** Starac 2004: 167-170, 183; Blečić 2009: 144, Fig. 1; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 6; Blečić Kavur 2012: Fig. 2.

## GODAČ

**Discovery:** Late roman fortification Godač on Kotor above Crikvenica was partly excavated in 2007. During the cleaning of the ruins a fragment of a bracelet and a ring were discovered. The rescue excavations were conducted by PPMHP Rijeka, where the finds are preserved.

9. Fragment of a smaller bronze cuff-shaped bracelet. It is heavy patinated and partly corroded. Preserved is the straight edge with 2 irregular and damaged holes. The edges are slightly rounded and everted. It is decorated with 6 lower and irregular ribs. The inner side is smooth.

**Size:** length 2.6 cm; width 2.9 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19330

**Literature:** unpublished

## KRK Baška

**Discovery:** The finds were collected during the excavations of the Prehistoric Commission by E. Nowotny in 1895 and M. Abramić and J. Szombathy in 1911 and 1912. During the excavations several finds were also donated to them by the local inhabitants. The finds are preserved in the NHMW in Vienna and partly entered in to the

poklonjeni predmeti od mjesnog stanovništva. Građa je pohranjena u NHMW u Beču i dijelom je inventarizirana pod »Insel Veglia«. Vjerojatno je riječ o inventaru jednog groba, kako se navodi i u starijoj literaturi?

10. Tri jantarna zrna tipa Tiryns, cilindričnog oblika sa 2 rebra po sredini, ovalnog presjeka. U sredini je probušena veća rupa za provlačenje.

**Veličina:** duž. 2,1-2,6 cm; šir. 2,7-3 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72564, 72565

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 426, T. XXIII: 15-16; Palavestra 1993: Tip 1, 2, 3: 62-63, 183; Glogović 1989: T. 43:1-2.

11. Djelomično očuvana jantarna zrna tipa Allumiere, cilindričnog i ovalnog oblika, ovalnog presjeka, horizontalno narebreni i longitudinalno probušeni. Ukupno 9 komada. Kroz jedno je zrno provučena brončana žica četvrtastog presjeka.

**Veličina:** duž. 3,1-4,2 cm; šir. 1,3-3,4 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72563, 72566

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 426-427, T. XXIII: 13a,b-14; Palavestra 1993: Tip 4, 62-63, 183; Forenbaher 1995: T. 2, Fig. 6: 6-8.

12. Koštane perle, pločastog oblika, manjih veličina, ukupno 59 komada.

**Veličina:** pr. 0,4-1,2 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72568-72570

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 427, T. XXIII: 19-21; Mader 2006: Abb. 18.

13. Brončani obručasti privjesci, manjih dimenzija, okruglog presjeka žice. Ukupno 200 komada.

**Veličina:** pr. 2 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72539

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 427, T. XXIII: 18; Batović 2003: Sl. 8; Mader 2006: 262, Abb. 16.

14. Narukvice od brončanog lima, dvoslivnog presjeka. Ukupno 18 cijelih primjeraka i 3 ulomka.

**Veličina:** pr. 5,9-7 cm; šir. 1 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72536

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 424, T. XXIII: 6; Mader 2006: Abb. 16.

15. Ukrasi od spiralno uvijene brončane trake-saltaleoni, ukupno 14 komada različitih veličina.

**Veličina:** duž. 0,7-11 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72552

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 427, T. XXIII: 17; Batović 2003: Sl. 8.

## Sv. Fuska (Pinezići)

**Nalaz:** Lokacija je smještena na zapadnoj obali otoka Krka, ispod sela Pinezići. Vrh koplja objavio je C. Marchesetti bez pobližih okolnosti njegova nalaza.

16. Brončani vrh koplja blago plamenastog oblika srednje veličine. Prijelaz iz lista u okrugli i izduženi tuljac za nasad je oštar, a težište lista je postavljeno nešto više.

**Veličina:** nedostupna.

**Literatura:** Marchesetti 1903: TXI: 18; Batović 1980: T. VI: 12.

## Vrbnik

**Nalaz:** Ulomak sjekire sa zaliscima objavio je C. Marchesetti, čije okolnosti nalaza kao ni pohrana nisu poznate.

17. Ulomak tijela brončane sjekire s više podignutim zaliscima,

inventory under »Insel Veglia«. As it was mentioned in the older literature, it is most probably the inventory of a single grave?

10. Three amber beads of the Tiryns type of cylindrical form and cross-section with 2 ribs in the middle. The bead is pierced in the middle.

**Size:** length 2.1 to 2.6 cm; width 2.7 to 3 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72564, 72565

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 426, T. XXIII: 15-16; Palavestra 1993: type 1, 2, 3: 62-63, 183; Glogović 1989: T. 43:1-2.

11. Partly preserved amber beads of the Allumiere type. Of cylindrical and oval form, oval cross-section, horizontally ribbed and longitudinally pierced. All together were discovered 9 pieces. Inside the piercing of one bead is stuck a piece of bronze wire with square cross-section.

**Size:** length 3.1 to 4.2 cm; width 1.3 to 3.4 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72563, 72566

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 426-427, T. XXIII: 13a,b-14; Palavestra 1993: type 4, 62-63, 183; Forenbaher 1995: T. 2, Fig. 6: 6-8.

12. Smaller flat bone beads. All together were discovered 59 pieces.

**Size:** diameter 0.4 to 1.2 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72568-72570

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 427, T. XXIII: 19-21; Mader 2006: Abb. 18.

13. Smaller bronze ring-shaped pendants with a round cross-section of the wire. All together were discovered 200 pieces.

**Size:** diameter 2 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72539

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 427, T. XXIII: 18; Batović 2003: Sl. 8; Mader 2006: 262, Abb. 16.

14. Bronze bracelets with a double-pitch cross-section. All together 18 preserved examples and 3 fragments were discovered.

**Size:** diameter 5.9-7 cm; width 1 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72536

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 424, T. XXIII: 6; Mader 2006: Abb. 16.

15. Decorations from spirally twisted bronze band – saltaleoni. 14 pieces of different sizes were discovered.

**Size:** length 0.7 to 11 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72552

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 427, T. XXIII: 17; Batović 2003: Sl. 8.

## Sv. Fuska (Pinezići)

**Discovery:** Site was located on the western side of the island of Krk below the village of Pinezići. The spear point was published by C. Marchesetti without any detailed information's about its discovery.

16. Middle sized flame shaped spear point. The transitions from the leaf in to the round and elongated shaft is sharp. The center of gravity of the point is located a little bit higher towards the middle of the point.

**Size:** not accessible.

**Literature:** Marchesetti 1903: TXI: 18; Batović 1980: T. VI: 12.

## Vrbnik

**Discovery:** Fragment of a wing shaped axe was published by C. Marchesetti. The circumstances of its discovery and its whereabouts are not known.

17. Fragment of the body of a wing shaped axe with lifted wings, with a damaged but rounded a relatively closed summit, with a small hole, and with the short bent flanges.

oštećenog ali zaobljenog, i prilično zatvorenog tjemena s malom rupicom, relativno kratko presavijenih zalizaka.

**Literatura:** Marchesetti 1903: T. XI: 12; Batović 1980: T. VI: 9; Žeravica 1993: 73, T. 20: 249A.

## Otok Krk?

**Nalaz:** Sporadični nalazi bez pobližih podataka o načinu i okolnostima nalaženja potječu najvjerojatnije također iz istraživanja na bašćanskom području. Građa se nalazi u NHMW u Beču i inventarizirana je pod »Insel Veglia«. Skup nalaza upućuje da je možda riječ o inventaru jednoga groba?

- 18.** Brončani trapezasti privjesci antropomorfog oblika, ukupno 4 komada. Tijelo je plošno izvedeno od tankoga lima sa 4 istake sa strana i jednom na vrhu na kojoj se nalazi uska perforacija za oves. Jedan od privjesaka na tijelu ima ukras urezanih koncentričnih kružnica koje su međusobno spojene trostruko urezanom linijom. Dva su privjeska sačuvana gotovo u cijelosti, a dva su znatnije oštećena.

**Veličina:** nedostupna. Inv. br.: NHMW

**Literatura:** Batović 2003: Sl. 15: 1-2; Sl. 18: 1-4.

- 19.** Pinceta od tankog brončanog lima s trokutasto oblikovanim hvataljkama, na kojima se nalazi ukras od 7 urezanih kružnica. Nožice su tordirane i blago proširene u ušicu.

**Veličina:** duž. 5,5 cm; šir. 1,7 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72553

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 424, T. XXIII: 11; Batović 2003: Sl. 15: 3, Sl. 18: 6.

- 20.** Ulomak lučno savijene brončane, tordirane žice, četvrtastog presjeka s ostatkom jedne karičice, vjerojatno dio narukvice.

**Veličina:** pr. 8,1 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72546

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 424, T. XXII: 15; Batović 1980: T. VIII: 6.

- 21.** Brončani obručasti privjesci različitih veličina i profila, oko 182 komada.

**Veličina:** pr. 2,2 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72539, 72540, 72526, 72527

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 425, T. XXIII: 4-5, 7-8; Batović 2003: Sl. 8.

- 22.** Veće jantarno zrno tipa Tiryns, cilindričnog tijela sa središnjim tanko izvučenim rebrom, ovalnog presjeka. U sredini je probušena veća rupa za provlačenje.

**Veličina:** vis. 2,7 cm.

**Literatura:** Glogović 1989: T. 43: 1; Forenbaher 1995: T. 2.

- 23.** Jantarno zrno tipa Tiryns, cilindričnog oblika s rebrom, ovalnog presjeka. U sredini je probušena manja rupica za provlačenje.

**Veličina:** vis. 2,2 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72558

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 425, T. XXIII: 9; Palavestra 1993: 62-63;<sup>840</sup> Batović 2003: Sl. 4b, Sl. 6: 5.

- 24.** Četiri djelomično očuvana jantarna zrna tipa Allumiere, cilindričnog oblika, horizontalno narebrena.

**Veličina:** duž. 1,2-1,5 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72558

**Literature:** Marchesetti 1903: T. XI: 12; Batović 1980: T. VI: 9; Žeravica 1993: 73, T. 20: 249A.

## Island of Krk?

**Discovery:** Accidental finds without any information's about their discovery – most probably coming from the excavations on the territory of Baška. The finds are in the NHMW in Vienna and inventoried under "Insel Veglia". The finds indicate that we are perhaps looking at the grave goods from a single grave?

- 18.** Four bronze trapezoidal-anthropomorphic pendants. The body is flat and made from thin sheet metals with 4 protrusions on the sides and 1 on top which has a narrow perforation for hanging up. One of the pendants has the body decorated with a decoration of incised concentric circles which are linked with a triple incision. Two pendants are preserved complete while two are damaged.

**Size:** not accessible. Inv. nr.: NHMW

**Literature:** Batović 2003: Sl. 15: 1-2; Sl. 18: 1-4.

- 19.** Tweezers made from thin metal sheet with triangularly shaped clips which are decorated with 7 incised circles. The wire is twisted and shaped in to a sling.

**Size:** length 5.5 cm; width 1.7 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72553

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 424, T. XXIII: 11; Batović 2003: Sl. 15: 3, Sl. 18: 6.

- 20.** Fragment of a twisted and bent wire of a square cross-section with the remains of a single loop - most probably a part of a bracelet.

**Size:** diameter 8.1 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72546

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 424, T. XXII: 15; Batović 1980: T. VIII: 6.

- 21.** Bronze ring-shaped pendants of different sizes and profiles. Some 182 pieces were discovered.

**Size:** diameter 2.2 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72539, 72540, 72526, 72527

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 425, T. XXIII: 4-5, 7-8; Batović 2003: Sl. 8.

- 22.** A larger amber bead of the Tiryns type with a cylindrical body, a slightly elevated central rib and with an oval cross-section. It is pierced in the middle.

**Size:** height 2.7 cm.

**Literature:** Glogović 1989: T. 43: 1; Forenbaher 1995: T. 2.

- 23.** Amber bead of the Tiryns type with a cylindrical body, a central rib and with an oval cross-section. It is pierced in the middle.

**Size:** height 2.2 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72558

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 425, T. XXIII: 9; Palavestra 1993: 62-63;<sup>840</sup> Batović 2003: Sl. 4b, Sl. 6: 5.

- 24.** Four partly preserved amber beads of the Allumiere type with a cylindrical body and horizontally ribbed.

**Size:** length 1.2 to 1.5 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72558

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 425, T. XXIII: 9; Forenbaher 1995: T. 2; Batović 2003: Sl. 4: 2-3, Sl. 6: 5.

- 25.** Five fragments of bracelets with a double-pitch shaped cross-section made from metal sheet. Well preserved.

<sup>840</sup> A. Palavestra sva zrna tipa Tiryns i Allumiere obrađuje pod lokalitetom Baška, iako ih manji dio potječe iz "Krka"- sporadični nalaz (Lo Schiavo 1970: 425).

<sup>840</sup> A. Palavestra lists all the Tiryns and Allumiere type beads as Baška although a smaller number of chance finds comes from "Krk" (Lo Schiavo 1970: 425).

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 425, T. XXIII: 9; Forenbaher 1995: T. 2; Batović 2003: Sl. 4: 2-3, Sl. 6: 5.

25. Narukvice od brončanog lima, dvoslivnog presjeka, oštarih bridova. Dobro očuvane. Ukupno 5 komada.

**Veličina:** pr. 4,6-5,4 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW 72536

**Literatura:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 424, T. XXIII: 6; Glogović 1989: T. 37: 1-2.

## SENJ - Štela

**Nalaz:** U GMS pohranjeni su predmeti nakitnih dijelova nošnje prikupljeni kao pojedinačni nalaz na lokalitetu Štela u Senju, 1964. godine. Poblži podatci o okolnostima nalaženja nisu poznati.

26. Ulomak brončane lučne jednopetljaste fibule, slabo očuvane i izrazito patinirane. Na krajevima luka je tordirana sa 9 navoja, kružnog presjeka, a na najvišem dijelu luka je oštećena i četvrtastog presjeka. Navoj i igla nisu sačuvani, dok je nožica prilično oštećena, J presjeka. Ukrašena je sa dva reda iskuca-nih kružnica. Opis prema izvornom crtežu.

**Veličina:** duž. 13,5 cm. Inv. br.: GMS?-izgubljena

27. Brončana tordirana ogrlica, okruglog presjeka i glatkih krajeva. Oštećena i korodirana.

**Veličina:** pr. 12 cm. Inv. br.: GMS 78

28. Brončana tordirana narukvica, okruglog presjeka žice, s alkom i kukicom za zatvaranje.

**Veličina:** pr. 6 cm. Inv. br.: GMS 79

**Literatura:** Glavičić 1969: 11, Abb. 2: 1; Ljubović 2000: 57-58, kat. 9-11; Glogović 2003: 14, T. 8: 50.

## KOŠLJUN

### Zbirka Franjevačkog samostana

**Nalaz:** U zbirci ZFS čuva se nekoliko predmeta koji potječu s otoka Krka, nepoznate točnije lokacije i okolnosti nalaženja.

29. Velika brončana, lučna jednopetljasta fibula. Oštećena, savijana, korodirana. Sačuvan jedan navoj opruge i polukružno raskovana nožica. Igla nedostaje. Neukrašena.

**Veličina:** duž. 15 cm; vis. 6,4 cm. Inv. br.: ZFS Košljun

**Literatura:** Glogović 2003: 14, T. 7: 43; KORi, Inventar ZFS Košljun 2003: kat. 735.

## PAG

### Vidasi = Vidasa napolju

**Nalaz:** Vidasi se nalaze na sjevernom dijelu otoka Paga, na Lunu (Novalja). Strojnom devastacijom prostora Vidasa napolju 70-ih godina 20. stoljeća uništen je veći broj grobova, dijela prapovijesne nekropole. Građa je pohranjena u zbirci crkvenih starina *Stomorica* u Novalji.

30. Veće jantarno zrno, blago zaobljeno tipa Tiryns. U sredini je probušena manja rupica za provlačenje.

**Veličina:** duž. 4,8 cm; pr. 3,3 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

31. Fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, oštećena i patinirana. Luk je okruglog presjeka i ukrašen urezanim geometrijskim motivi-

**Size:** diameter 4.6 to 5.4 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW 72536

**Literature:** Lo Schiavo 1970: 424, T. XXIII: 6; Glogović 1989: T. 37: 1-2.

## SENJ- Štela

**Discovery:** In the GMS are preserved pieces of attire collected in 1964 as chance finds from the locality Štela in Senj. No detailed information's about the discovery are known.

26. Fragment of a bronze bow fibula with a single loop. It is heavily patinated and badly preserved. The ends are twisted with 9 twists. It has a round cross-section, on the highest part of the bow it has a square cross-section and is damaged. The pin and the coils are missing; the J shaped foot is damaged. It is decorated with two rows of impressed circles. The description was made according to the original illustration.

**Size:** length 13.5 cm. Inv. nr.: GMS?-lost

27. Bronze twisted necklace with a round cross-section and smooth ends. Damaged and corroded.

**Size:** diameter 12 cm. Inv. nr.: GMS 78

28. Bronze twisted bracelet with a round cross-section of the wire and with a ring and hook for closing.

**Size:** diameter 6 cm. Inv. nr.: GMS 79

**Literature:** Glavičić 1969: 11, Abb. 2: 1; Ljubović 2000: 57-58, cat. 9-11; Glogović 2003: 14, T. 8: 50.

## KOŠLJUN

### Collection of the St. Francis Monastery

**Discovery:** In the collection of the ZFS are kept several finds originating from the island of Krk. The circumstances and locations of the discovery are not known.

29. Large bronze bow fibula with a single loop. Damaged, bent and corroded. Preserved is a single loop of the coil and the semicircular hammered foot. The pin is missing. It is not decorated.

**Size:** length 15 cm; height 6.4 cm. Inv. nr.: ZFS Košljun

**Literature:** Glogović 2003: 14, T. 7: 43; KORi, Inventory ZFS Košljun 2003: cat. 735.

## PAG

### Vidasi = Vidasa napolju

**Discovery:** The site of Vidasi is located on the northern part of the island of Pag on Lun (Novalja). During the destruction of the locality Vidasa napolju, in the seventies of the 20th century, a larger number of graves were destroyed; most probably a part of the prehistoric necropolis. Finds are preserved in the collection of churchly antiquities *Stomorica* in Novalja.

30. A larger amber bead, slightly rounded – of the Tiryns type. The central part is pierced with a smaller hole.

**Size:** length 4.8 cm; diameter 3.3 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

31. Fibula with two knobs on the bow damaged and patinated. The bow has a round cross-section and is decorated with incised geometric motives. Sheaves of parallel lines form the metope fields which are filled with different ornaments. First metope on every side of the knob is empty. In the second and third one are located incised zigzag hatched lines. The metopes of the highest part of the bow are densely incised with motives of alternating hatched rhombs. Below the knob, towards the termination of the bow are

ma. Snopovi paralelnih linija formiraju metopna polja, koja su ispunjena različitim ornamentom. Prva metopa, sa svake strane iznad dugmeta, je prazna. U drugoj i trećoj metopi urezane su cik-cak šrafirane linije. U metopama najvišeg dijela luka gusto su urezani motivi naizmjenično šrafiranih rombova. Ispod dugmeta, prema završetku luka, urezana su 3 snopa paralelnih linija, bez ispuna metopnih površina. Luk prelazi u raskovani navoj rombičnog presjeka. Igla nije sačuvana. Nožica je raskovana u trokutastu pločicu bez ukrasa.

**Veličina:** duž. 20,5 cm; vis. 11,9 cm; pr. luka 0,8 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

32. Ulomak fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku, oštećena, izlizana i patinirana. Luk je djelomično očuvan sa jednim diskastim plošno profiliranim dugmetom, okruglog presjeka i ukrašen urezanim geometrijskim motivima. Iznad dugmeta su metopne površine prazne, a čine ih 3 snopa usporedno urezanih linija. U metopi najvišeg dijela luka gusto su urezani motivi naizmjenično šrafiranih rombova. Ispod dugmeta, prema završetku luka, urezana su 4 snopa paralelnih linija, bez ispuna metopnih površina. Luk je na kraju raskovan.

**Veličina:** duž. 13,4 cm; pr. luka 1 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

33. Lučna fibula bez petlje, okruglog presjeka luka, s trokutasto raskovanom nožicom i s nosačem za iglu. Na luku se djelomično razaznaje ukras urezanih borovih grančica. Igla je okruglog presjeka.

**Veličina:** duž. 16,6 cm; vis. 9,6 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

34. Ulomak masivne brončane igle s okruglom glavicom, znatno oštećen i korodiran. Vrat je plitko tordiran.

**Veličina:** duž. 7,7 cm; pr. glavice 1,7 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

35. Ulomak manje oštećene i znatno korodirane brončane igle s okruglom glavicom. Glavica je zaobljena s narebrenim ukrasom po vratu, okruglog presjeka.

**Veličina:** duž. 3,5 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

36. Masivna brončana narukvica manšetastog tipa, ovalnog oblika, ravnih i razdvojenih krajeva, neravnomjerno uvučениh. Rubnici su sa svih strana blago izvučeni i zaobljeni. Središnjim dijelom narukvice teče 5 širih a oštirih rebra.

**Veličina:** šir. 3,3 cm; pr. 5,4 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

37. Narukvica dvoslivnog presjeka od brončanog lima sa spiralno prebačenim krajevima.

**Veličina:** pr. 9,2 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

38. Narukvica dvoslivnog presjeka od brončanog lima, zatvorenog tipa. Na oštirim rubovima odlomljena i oštećena.

**Veličina:** pr. 10,8 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

39. Dvije narukvice dvoslivnog presjeka od brončanog lima, zatvorenog tipa. Na oštirim rubovima odlomljena i oštećena.

**Veličina:** pr. 9,3 cm. pr. najveće 9,7 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

40. Brončana, djelomično očuvana jednodijelna zmijasta fibula sa dvije petlje i ravnom iglom. Petlje na luku su veće i četvrtastog presjeka. Luk je listasto i rombično raskovan, izvijen i povišen prema petlji noge, sa središnjim rebrom. Igla je ravna, izdužena i oštećena. Noga i nosač igle nedostaju.

**Veličina:** duž. 14,4 cm; vis. 7,2 cm. Inv. br.: *Stomorica*

**Literatura:** Glogović 1991: 17-24, T. 1-3; Glogović 2003: 7, 10, 14, 36-37, 42, T. 1: 6, T. 4: 21-22, T. 8: 46, T. 37: 274, T. 42: 328.

incised 3 parallel lines without the metope fields. The spring has a rhomboid cross-section, the pin is not preserved. The foot is forged in to a triangular plate without any decorations.

**Size:** length 20.5 cm; height 11.9 cm; diameter of the bow 0.8 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

32. Fragment of a fibula with two knobs on the bow. It is damaged, worn and patinated. The bow is partly preserved with a single discoid flat knob with a round cross-section and incised with geometric motives. The metope fields above the knob are made from 3 sheaves of parallel incised lines and empty. In the metope on the highest part of the bow were densely incised motives of alternately hatched rhombs. Below the knob towards the end of the bow are incised 4 sheaves of parallel lines with empty metope fields. The bow is hammered in to a flat form at the end.

**Size:** length 13.4 cm; diameter of the bow 1 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

33. Bow fibula without the loop. It has a round cross-section with a triangularly hammered foot and a holder for the pin. On the bow are areas where one can still see the incised decoration in the form of a pine twig. The pin has a round cross-section.

**Size:** length 16.6 cm; height 9.6 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

34. Fragment of a massive bronze pin with a circular head. The neck is twisted. Damaged and corroded.

**Size:** length 7.7 cm; diameter of the head 1.7 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

35. Fragment of a smaller damaged and heavily corroded bronze pin with a circular head. The head is rounded with a ribbed decoration on the neck.

**Size:** length 3.5 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

36. Massive bronze cuff-shaped bracelet. With straight and separated but unevenly curved ends. The edges are slightly everted and thickened. On the central part of the bracelet are 5 sharp broader ribs.

**Size:** width 3.3 cm; diameter 5.4 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

37. Bracelet with double-pitch shaped cross-section made from bronze sheet metal with spirally overlapping ends.

**Size:** diameter 9.2 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

38. Bracelet with double-pitch shaped cross-section made from bronze sheet metal with closed ends. The edges are broken and damaged.

**Size:** diameter 10.8 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

39. Two fragments of a bracelet with double-pitch shaped cross-section made from bronze sheet metal with closed ends. The edges are broken and damaged.

**Size:** diameter 9.3 cm. diameter of the largest 9.7 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

40. Bronze partly preserved serpentine fibula with two coils and a straight pin. The coils on the bow are larger and have a square cross-section. The bow is leaf-shaped and rhombically hammered, bent and elevated towards the spring of the foot. It has a central rib. The pin is straight, elongated and damaged. The foot and the holder are missing.

**Size:** length 14.4 cm; height 7.2 cm. Inv. nr.: *Stomorica*

**Literature:** Glogović 1991: 17-24, T. 1-3; Glogović 2003: 7, 10, 14, 36-37, 42, T. 1: 6, T. 4: 21-22, T. 8: 46, T. 37: 274, T. 42: 328.

## Dabi = Dabo stanovi

**Nalaz:** Slučajno prikupljeni predmeti nakitnih dijelova nošnje prilikom obrade zemljišta u Dabovim stanovima na Lunu u Novalji 1954. godine. Uvriježeno je da potječu svi iz jednog, uništenog u kamenoj škrinji s poklopnicom, zgrčenog ukopa pokojnika. Vjerojatnije je riječ o predmetima sakupljenima iz više grobnih inventara ili iz ranije poremećenih konteksta.

41. Ulomak veće brončane, zmijaste dvodijelne fibule, izrazito korodirane i oštećene. Noga luka je okruglog presjeka i završava jednim navojem, kojim je prelazila u sedlasti dio luka. Završava raskovanim suženim klinom za pričvršćivanje u iglu. Iгла je sačuvana u dva dijela, lukovičastog oblika glavice s prstenastim rebrom i četvrtastim perforiranim zadebljanjem za klin luka.<sup>841</sup>

**Veličina:** duž. 8,4 cm; duž. luka 4,6 cm; pr. glavice igle 1,9 cm. Inv. br.: AMZadar *Novalja*

42. Brončana lučna jednopetljasta fibula, okruglog presjeka luka s oprugom od jednog navoja pravokutnog presjeka. Nožica je polukružno raskovana i odlomljena. Iгла je okruglog presjeka, zašiljenog završetka.

**Veličina:** duž. 8,3 cm. Inv. br.: AMZadar *Novalja*

43. Brončana kalotasta dugmad različitih veličina, s ušicom za prišivanje sa stražnje strane.

**Veličina:** pr. većeg 4,2 cm; pr. manjeg 1,3 cm. Inv. br.: AMZadar *Novalja*

**Literatura:** Batović 1973: 117-121, T. CIII; Glogović 1988a: T. II: 4; Glogović 1989: T. 19: 5; Glogović 2003: 20, 48, 63, T. 12: 92, T. 47: 363A, T. 52: 476.

## KRK Sužan

**Nalaz:** Kameni tumul u Sužanu nalazio se kod Dobrinja, uz sjeveroistočni dio Krka, a razoren je prilikom drobljenja kamena. Preciznije okolnosti nalaza nisu poznate. Ulomak mača prikupljen je prilikom radova i pohranjen je u PPMHP Rijeka.

44. Ulomak brončanog mača jezičastog rukohvata, snažno korodiranog i patiniranog. Sačuvan je najveći dio rukohvata ravnog oblika, kojem su u središnjem dijelu jednakomjerno raspoređene dvije nepravilne rupice za zakovice. Kraj rukohvata je odlomljen, s djelomično prepoznatljivom još jednom rupicom na prijelomu. Rubnici su izvučeni i ojačani, a pri dnu se proširuju u ramena, koja su odlomljena. Zbog toga je sačuvan i samo ulomak sječiva, kome je središnje rebro usko i nenaglašeno, odnosno rombičnog je presjeka. Rubovi sječiva su odlomljeni i oštećeni.

**Veličina:** duž. 8,8 cm; šir. rukohvata 1,9 cm; šir. sječiva 1,4 cm; deb. 0,85. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19223

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

## Šula

**Nalaz:** Pješčara Šula smještena je kod sela Polje pokraj Dobrinja, uz sjeveroistočni potez otoka Krka, gdje su dokumentirani kameni tumuli manjih konstrukcija. Eksploatacijom pijeska

## Dabi = Dabo stanovi

**Discovery:** Chance finds of attire collected in 1954 during the work on the fields in Dabovi stanovi on Lun (Novalja). It is believed that they come from a single destroyed burial of a deceased, inhumed in a crouched position in a stone box with a covering. But, it is more likely that the artifacts were collected from several damaged grave inventories.

41. Fragment of a larger bronze two-part serpentine fibula. It is heavily corroded and damaged. The foot of the bow has a round cross-section and ends with a single coil which was the transition in to the saddle-shaped part of the bow. It ends with a forged narrow wedge used for the fixing of the pin. The pin is broken in to two pieces. It has an onion-shaped head with a ring shaped rib and square perforated thickening for the wedge of the bow.<sup>841</sup>

**Size:** length 8.4 cm; length of the bow 4.6 cm; diameter of the pins head 1.9 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZadar *Novalja*

42. Bronze bow fibula with a single loop. The bow has a round cross-section. A part of a single coil with a square cross-section in preserved. The foot is semicircular hammered and broken. The pin has a round cross-section and a pointed tip.

**Size:** length 8.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZadar *Novalja*

43. Bronze calotte-shaped buttons of different sizes. They have a sling for fixing on the lower side.

**Size:** diameter of the larger ones 4.2 cm; diameter of the smaller ones 1.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZadar *Novalja*

**Literature:** Batović 1973: 117-121, T. CIII; Glogović 1988a: T. II: 4; Glogović 1989: T. 19: 5; Glogović 2003: 20, 48, 63, T. 12: 92, T. 47: 363A, T. 52: 476.

## KRK Sužan

**Discovery:** Tumulus was located near Dobrinj on the north-eastern part of the island of Krk. It was destroyed during crushing of stones. Precise circumstances are not known. The fragment was discovered during the works and preserved in the PPMHP in Rijeka.

44. Fragment of sword with a tang-shaped hilt. It is heavily corroded and patinated. Preserved is the largest part of the hilt with two holes in the middle. The end is broken off with a recognizable rest of another hole on the point of the break. The flanges are emphasized and are widening towards the blade. Only the central part of the blade is preserved. It has a central rib which is narrow and low with a rhomboidal cross-section. The edges of the blade are broken and damaged.

**Size:** length 8.8 cm; width of the hilt 1.9 cm; width of the blade 1.4 cm; thickness 0.8. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19223

**Literature:** unpublished

## Šula

**Discovery:** The gravel pit Šula is located near the village Polje near Dobrinj on the north-eastern part of the island Krk where smaller stone tumuli are known. Graves without any detailed information's were destroyed on two occasions during the

<sup>841</sup> Predložena rekonstrukcija i postav fibule nisu ispravni (Batović 1973: T. CIII: 2).

<sup>841</sup> The proposed reconstruction and setup of the fibula are not correct (Batović 1973: T. CIII: 2).

u dva su pokušaja devastirani i uništeni grobovi, bez preciznijih podataka. Dvije fibule i dvije narukvice s lokacije Sv. Ivan prispjele su u AMZ. Samo 200 m podalje od navedene lokacije, 1966. godine devastiran je još jedan nadgrobni tumul manjih dimenzija i na relativnoj dubini od 6 m. U tumulu se nalazila komora od debelih, neobrađenih škrlja, koja je sadržavala samo jedan ukop. Ostaci bedrenih kostiju analizirani su na Medicinskom fakultetu u Rijeci, prilikom čega je potvrđeno da nema tragova spaljivanja. Kao prilog nađeni su nakitni dijelovi nošnje, fibula i dvije igle.<sup>842</sup>

45. Fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, izlizana i patinirana. Luk je okruglog presjeka, neznatno se proširuje prema opruzi, sa dva dugmeta diskasta oblika i ukrasom urezanih geometrijskih motiva. Snopovi paralelnih linija formiraju metopna polja, koja su ispunjena različitim ornamentom. Prva metopa je sa svake strane prazna, u drugoj i trećoj metopi, iznad dugmeta, urezan je cik-cak motiv. U četvrtoj je metopi, također sa svake strane, urezan dvostruki motiv riblje kosti. Središnje metopno polje na najvišem je dijelu luka najuže, ukrašeno urezanim rombovima, ispunjenim motivom riblje kosti. Ispod dugmeta, prema završetku luka, urezana su 4 snopa paralelnih linija, bez ispuna metopnih površina. Luk završava velikom, predimenzionirano raskovanom oprugom, rombičnog presjeka, koja prelazi u iglu, okruglog presjeka. Nožica je raskovana, polukružna i uz rubove ukrašena sa 2 reda iskucanih kružnica.

**Veličina:** duž. 17,5 cm; vis. 11,4 cm; deb. luka 0,9 cm. Inv. br.: ZFS Košljun

46. Fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, izlizana i patinirana. Luk je okruglog presjeka, ukrašen urezanim geometrijskim motivima i sa dva dugmeta diskasta oblika. Snopovi paralelnih linija formiraju metopna polja, koja su ispunjena različitim ornamentom. U prvoj metopi, sa svake strane iznad dugmeta, urezane su girlande i paralelno s njima cik-cak motiv. U drugoj metopi koja se ponavlja i ukrašava najviši dio luka, gusto su urezani motivi riblje kosti. Ispod dugmeta, prema završetku luka, urezana su 4 snopa paralelnih linija, bez ispuna metopnih površina. Luk prelazi u raskovanu oprugu od jednog navoja, rombičnog presjeka, koji završava iglom okruglog presjeka. S druge strane, urezana su 3 snopa paralelnih linija ispod dugmeta na luku, koji je raskovan i završava trokutastom nožicom bez ukrasa.

**Veličina:** duž. 16,5 cm, vis. 9,4 cm. Inv. br.: ZFS Košljun

47. Brončana igla s lukovičastom glavicom, patinirana i dobro očuvana. Glavica je manja, ovalno oblikovana sa središnjom rupicom na vrhu. Vrat je blago zadebljan, kružnog presjeka i naknadno gusto tordiran. Igla se postupno sužava, okruglog je presjeka i zašiljenog završetka.

**Veličina:** duž. 22,5 cm; pr. glavice 1,2 cm. Inv. br.: ZFS Košljun

48. Brončana igla s lukovičastom glavicom, znatno korodirana i patinirana. Glavica je naglašeno ovalno oblikovana s istakom na vrhu. Vrat je blago zadebljan, kružnog presjeka i naknadno koso tordiran u širim razmacima. Igla je raskovana, okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog završetka.

**Veličina:** duž. 21,1 cm; pr. glavice 1,4 cm. Inv. br.: ZFS Košljun

49. Masivna brončana narukvica manšetastog tipa ravnih krajeva, ovalnog oblika i bez naglašenih rubnika. Središnjim

gravel digging. Two fibulae and two bracelets from the site of Sv. Ivan are preserved in the AMZ. Only 200 meters away from the locality in 1966 another smaller tumulus was devastated. Inside was discovered a chamber made from unworked stone plates containing a single burial. The remains of long bones were analyzed on the Faculty of medicine in Rijeka confirming that there were detected no traces of cremation. The grave goods consisted of a fibula and two pins.<sup>842</sup>

45. Fibula with two knobs on the bow. Eroded and patinated. The bow has a round cross-section and is widening a little bit towards the coil. Two knobs of discoid form are decorated with geometric motives. Sheaves of parallel lines form metope fields which are filled with different ornaments. The first metope on each side is empty, in the second and third metope, above the knob, are incised zigzag motives. In the fourth metope, on each side, are incised two rows of motives in the form of a pine twig. The central metope field on the highest point of the bow is narrow and decorated with incised rhombs filled with the motive of a pine twig. Below the knob, towards the end of the bow, are incised 4 sheaves of parallel lines without the fillings of metope fields. The bow ends with a large coil with a rhomboidal cross-section continuing in to a pin with a round cross-section. The foot is hammered, semicircular in shape and along the edges decorated with 2 rows of circles.

**Size:** length 17.5 cm; height 11.4 cm; thickness of the bow 0.9 cm. Inv. nr.: ZFS Košljun

46. Fibula with two knobs on the bow. Eroded and patinated. The bow has a round cross-section, decorated with geometric motives, and two knobs of discoid form. Sheaves of parallel lines form metope fields which are filled with different ornaments. In the first metope on each side above the knob are incised garlands and parallel to them zigzag motives. In the second metope, decorating the highest part of the bow, are densely incised motives of pine twig. Below the knob, towards the end of the bow, are incised 4 sheaves of parallel lines without the filling of metope fields. The bow ends with a coil with a rhomboidal cross-section continuing in to a pin with a round cross-section. On the other side are below the knob incised 3 sheaves of parallel lines. The bow ends hammered in a triangular foot lacking any decoration.

**Size:** length 16.5 cm, height 9.4 cm. Inv. nr.: ZFS Košljun

47. Pin with an onion-shaped head, patinated and well preserved. The smaller head has a central hole on the top. The neck is slightly thickened, has a round cross-section and is densely twisted. The pin has a round cross-section and a pointed end.

**Size:** length 22.5 cm; diameter of the head 1.2 cm. Inv. nr.: ZFS Košljun

48. Pin with an onion-shaped had. The head is corroded and the pin patinated. The oval-shaped head has a protrusion on the top. The neck is slightly thickened, has a round cross-section and is widely twisted. The pin has a round cross-section and a pointed end.

**Size:** length 21.1 cm; diameter of the head 1.4 cm. Inv. nr.: ZFS Košljun

49. Massive bronze cuff-shaped bracelet. The central part of the bracelet is covered with 5 narrow ribs.

**Size:** width 4.1 cm; diameter 6.2 cm. Inv. nr.: ZFS Košljun

**Literature:** Ljubić 1876: 32, T. III: 36, 36 cat. H-a4; Ljubić 1889:

<sup>842</sup> Matejčić 1966.

<sup>842</sup> Matejčić 1966.



dijelom narukvice izvučeno je 5 uskih ukrasnih rebara.

**Veličina:** šir. 4,1 cm; pr. 6,2 cm. Inv. br.: ZFS Košljun

**Literatura:** Ljubić 1876: 32, T. III: 36, 36 kat. H-a4; Ljubić 1889: 32, 36; Matejčić 1966: 336-339, Foto. 2; Batović 1983: T. XLV: 5-7; Glogović 1987: 73-91, T. I; Glogović 1989: T. 5: 3-4, T. 13, T. 35: 1-3; Teržan 1995: 339, Abb. 27; Pare 1998: Abb. 15: 3; Inventar ZFS Košljun KORi 2003: 729-733; Batović 2003: Sl. 3: 1, Sl. 5, Sl. 6: 4; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 4.

## CRES

### Cres-Merag

**Nalaz:** U MC nalaze se sporadični nalazi iz bliže okolice grada Cresa, iako postoji realna mogućnost da su nađeni na gradini Sv. Bartolomej na Mergu.<sup>843</sup>

50. Narukvica od brončanog lima, četvrtastog presjeka.

**Veličina:** pr. 6,9 cm. Inv. br.: MC

51. Narukvice od brončanog lima, dvoslivnog presjeka. Ukupno 7 kom., sva na oštrim rubovima odlomljena i oštećena.

**Veličina:** pr. 7,8 cm. Inv. br.: MC

52. Ulomak narukvice brončanog lima, dvoslivnog presjeka.

**Veličina:** pr. 6,8 cm. Inv. br.: MC

**Literatura:** Glogović 1989: T. 6: 13; 37: 3-4, 7; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 498, T. 6. 4-5.

### Osor-Kavanela

**Nalaz:** Iz Osora, najjužnijeg mjesta otoka Cresa, potječe većina predmeta materijalne kulture iz starijih istraživanja nekropole Kavanele s lošinjske strane kanala. Iskopavanja je između 1874. i 1881. godine provodio osorski župnik vlč. I. Bolmarčić, a potom i S. Petris. I. Bolmarčić nešto vrijedniju građu, tj. numizmatičku kolekciju odnosi sa sobom u Krk, gdje nastavlja službovanje.<sup>844</sup> Sva je građa bila prilično oštećena za i prilikom istraživanja, kao i zbog uvjeta u kojima je bila čuvana (npr. 1882.), a znatan dio je već u ono vrijeme bio rasprodan.<sup>845</sup> O samim istraživanjima izvještavali su E. von Sacken, O. von Benndorf i A. R. Klodič za austrijsku KK Komisiju prilikom čega su nekoliko predmeta, uglavnom nakita, i publicirali.<sup>846</sup> U istoj reviji i S. Petris kratko izvještava o svojim istraživanjima provedenim u dvije kampanje 1884. i 1887. godine.<sup>847</sup> Dio predmeta objavio je C. Marchesetti 1924. godine, koji je ujedno i komentirao prethodne objave kao i samu metodologiju iskopavanja te dnevnik istraživanja kojeg je vodio I. Bolmarčić. Prema dostupnim podacima na Kavaneli se vršilo biritualno sahranjivanje u nekropoli na ravnom tijekom čitavog kasnog brončanog i željeznog doba te ranoantičkoga vremena.<sup>848</sup> Građa je najvećim dijelom pohranjena u AZO u Osoru, a manji dio nalazi se u AMI u Puli te na Krku.

53. Velika brončana izrazito korodirana igla s lukovičastom glavicom i s ovalnim vretenastim zadebljanjem vrata, djelomično

32, 36; Matejčić 1966: 336-339, Photo. 2; Batović 1983: T. XLV: 5-7; Glogović 1987: 73-91, T. I; Glogović 1989: T. 5: 3-4, T. 13, T. 35: 1-3; Teržan 1995: 339, Abb. 27; Pare 1998: Abb. 15: 3; Inventory ZFS Košljun KORi 2003: 729-733; Batović 2003: Sl. 3: 1, Sl. 5, Sl. 6: 4; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 4.

## CRES

### Cres-Merag

**Discovery:** In the MC are located chance finds from the vicinity of the town of Cres, although there is a possibility that they were discovered on the hill-fort of Sv. Bartolomej on Merag.<sup>843</sup>

50. Bronze bracelet with a square cross-section.

**Size:** diameter 6.9 cm. Inv. nr.: MC

51. Bracelet with a double-pitch cross-section made from bronze sheet metal. Preserved are 7 fragments which have the edges damaged and broken.

**Size:** diameter 7.8 cm. Inv. nr.: MC

52. Fragment of bracelet with a double pitch cross-section made from bronze sheet metal.

**Size:** diameter 6.8 cm. Inv. nr.: MC

**Literature:** Glogović 1989: T. 6: 13; 37: 3-4, 7; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 498, T. 6. 4-5.

### Osor-Kavanela

**Discovery:** The majority of finds of material culture from Osor, the most southern city on the island of Cres, comes from old excavation on the necropolis of Kavanela located on the Lošinjs side of the channel between the islands of Cres and Lošinj. Excavations were conducted between 1874 and 1881 by the parish priest from Osor rvd. I. Bolmarčić and later also S. Petris. I. Bolmarčić took the more valuable items, the numismatic collection, with him to Krk where he continued his duties.<sup>844</sup> All finds were damaged at the time and during the discovery as well as due to the circumstances of its keeping (e.g. 1882.). A substantial part of finds was also sold.<sup>845</sup> Reports about the excavations were written by E. von Sacken, O. von Benndorf and A. R. Klodič for the Austrian K.K. Central-Commission. Several items, mostly jewelry were also depicted in these reports.<sup>846</sup> Petris reported in the same magazine about his two campaigns from 1884 and 1887.<sup>847</sup> Several finds were published by C. Marchesetti in 1924 who also commented the previous publications as well as the methodology of excavations and the diaries of excavations which were written by I. Bolmarčić. According to accessible information's the deceased were buried on Kavanela during the whole of the Late Bronze and Iron Age as well as the Early Roman period in skeletal and cremated graves on a flat necropolis.<sup>848</sup> Majority of finds are kept in the AZO in Osor, while a smaller part is preserved in AMI in Pula and on Krk.

53. Partly preserved large bronze corroded pin with an onion shaped head and oval spindle-form like thickened neck. The onion shaped head is decorated with shallow horizontal grooves – three on the upper and three on the lower half. The decoration

<sup>843</sup> Batović 2003: 278.

<sup>844</sup> Milčetić 1884: 83-85.

<sup>845</sup> Milčetić 1884: 84; Marchesetti 1924: 140-141.

<sup>846</sup> Sacken 1879; Benndorf 1880; Klodič 1885.

<sup>847</sup> Petris 1895; Petris 1897.

<sup>848</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 140-140.

<sup>843</sup> Batović 2003: 278.

<sup>844</sup> Milčetić 1884: 83-85.

<sup>845</sup> Milčetić 1884: 84; Marchesetti 1924: 140-141.

<sup>846</sup> Sacken 1879; Benndorf 1880; Klodič 1885.

<sup>847</sup> Petris 1895; Petris 1897.

<sup>848</sup> Marchesetti 1924: 140-140.

očuvana. Lukovičasta glava ukrašena je horizontalnim plitkim narebnjenjima, s po tri u donjoj i u gornjoj polovici. Na vratu se ne vidi jasno kombinacija ukrasnih motiva, već samo par urezanih linija na igli izravno ispod glavice.

**Veličina:** duž. 9,7 cm, pr. glavice 1,6 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 255

**Literatura:** Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 4: 4.

54. Velika brončana igla tipa Sirolo Numana očuvana u cijelosti. Glavica je diskasta oblika i na gornjem dijelu ukrašena urezanim ukrasom meandra čije su unutarnje linije šrafirane. Na gornjem dijelu vrata nalazi se okruglo zadebljanje sa četiri zašiljene istake, od kojih je jedna polomljena. Vrat igle je tordiran u dva dijela koja su odvojena s prstenastim rebrima četvrtastog presjeka. Iгла je ravna i okruglog presjeka. Kraj igle je zašiljen.

**Veličina:** duž. 30 cm; pr. glavice 1,6 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 155

**Literatura:** Klodič 1885: Fig. 5; Marchesetti 1924: Fig. 22: 3; Ćus-Rukonić 1981: T. III: 4; Glogović 1982b: Sl. 1: 1; Glogović 1989: T. 7: 9; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 4: 5; Lucentini 2007: Fig. 1: 1.

55. Fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, očuvana djelomično i izrazito deformirana uvijanjem u čvor. Luk je okruglog presjeka i ukrašen urezanim geometrijskim motivima. Snopovi paralelnih linija formiraju metopna polja, koja su ispunjena različitim ornamentom. Prva metopa je prazna. U drugoj se nalazi urezan motiv nasuprotno postavljenih girlandi, a u trećoj i četvrtoj metopi urezani su šrafirani tekući trokutići. Središnja metopa, najvišeg dijela luka, ima urezan motiv borovih grančica. Ispod dugmeta, prema završetku luka gdje se i trebala nalaziti opruga, urezana su 3 snopa paralelnih linija, bez ispuna metopnih površina. Luk prelazi u raskovani dio rombičnog presjeka, koji prelazi u iglu okruglog presjeka. Nožica je raskovana u polukružnu pločicu s iskucanim kružnicama neravnomjerno postavljenim. Sačuvano samo jedno dugme.

**Veličina:** duž. 20 cm. Inv. br.: AMI P/2173

**Literatura:** Glogović 1987: T. II: 1; Glogović 1989: T. 14: 1; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 5: 1; Glogović 2003: 9-10, T. 3: 18.

56. Fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, očuvana djelomično i izrazito deformirana uvijanjem u čvor. Luk je okruglog presjeka i ukrašen urezanim geometrijskim motivima. Snopovi paralelnih linija formiraju metopna polja, koja su ispunjena različitim ornamentom. Prva metopa, iznad dugmeta, je prazna. U drugoj se nalazi urezan motiv nasuprotno postavljenih girlandi, a u trećoj i četvrtoj metopi urezani su šrafirani tekući trokutići. Središnja metopa, najvišeg dijela luka, ima urezan motiv paralelnih crtica u 6 redova. Ispod dugmeta, prema završetku luka gdje se i trebala nalaziti opruga, urezana su 3 snopa paralelnih linija, bez ispuna metopnih površina. Luk prelazi u raskovani dio rombičnog presjeka, koji prelazi u iglu okruglog presjeka, zašiljenu. Nožica je raskovana u polukružnu pločicu bez ukrasa.

**Literatura:** Klodič 1885: Fig. 4; Precrtana kod Marchesetti 1924: 146, Fig. 23.<sup>849</sup>

on the neck is hardly visible – one can see only several incised lines on the pin just below the head.

**Size:** length 9.7 cm, diameter of the head 1.6 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 255

**Literature:** Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 4: 4.

54. Completely preserved large bronze pin of the Sirolo Numana Type. The head has a discoid form and is decorated on the upper side with incised ornament in the form of a meander with hatched inner lines. On the upper part of the neck is a circular thickening with four pointed protuberances. One of them is broken off. The neck is twisted and divided in to two parts which are separated with ring-shaped ribs with a square cross-section. The pin is straight and has a round cross-section. The end is pointed.

**Size:** length 30 cm; diameter of the head 1.6 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 155

**Literature:** Klodič 1885: Fig. 5; Marchesetti 1924: Fig. 22: 3; Ćus-Rukonić 1981: T. III: 4; Glogović 1982b: Sl. 1: 1; Glogović 1989: T. 7: 9; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 4: 5; Lucentini 2007: Fig. 1: 1.

55. Partly preserved and deformed bronze fibula with two knobs on the bow. It was bent in to a knot. The bow has a round cross-section and is decorated with incised geometric motives. Sheaves of parallel lines are forming metope fields which are filled with different ornaments. The first metope is empty. The second one includes incised motive of opposing garlands while in the third and fourth metope are incised hatched following triangles. The central metope on the highest part of the bow has an incised motive of a pine twig. Below the knob, towards the ending of the bow, where the spring should have been, are incised 3 sheaves of parallel lines without the filling of the metope fields. The bow passes over in to the hammered part with a rhomboidal cross-section and in to the pin with a round cross-section. The foot is hammered in to a semicircular plate decorated with irregularly positioned decoration of circles. Only a single knob is preserved.

**Size:** length 20 cm. Inv. nr.: AMI P/2173

**Literature:** Glogović 1987: T. II: 1; Glogović 1989: T. 14: 1; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 5: 1; Glogović 2003: 9-10, T. 3: 18.

56. Partly preserved and deformed fibula with two knobs on the bow. It was bent in to a knot. The bow has a round cross-section and is decorated with incised geometric motives. Sheaves of parallel lines are forming metope fields which are filled with different ornaments. The first metope is empty. The second one includes incised motive of opposing garlands while in the third and fourth metope are incised hatched following triangles. Central metope on the highest part of the bow has incised the ornament of 6 rows of parallel lines. Below the knob, towards the ending of the bow, where the spring should have been, are incised 3 sheaves of parallel lines without the filling of the metope fields. The bow passes over in to the hammered part with a rhomboidal cross-section and in to the pointed pin with round cross-section. The foot is hammered in to a semicircular plate without decoration.

**Literature:** Klodič 1885: Fig. 4; Depicted in Marchesetti 1924: 146, Fig. 23.<sup>849</sup>

<sup>849</sup> ...und zwei grössere Bogenfibeln aus Bronze 10 und 15 Cm. lang; der Dorn bei beiden an einer Spiralwindung federnd, am Ende des Nuthlappens bei ersterer eine Scheibe, bei letzterer ein lanzettförmiges Blatt, im Tremulirstich verziert. ... piše Sacken (1879: 150), što zapravo svjedoči o postojanju dvije takve lučne fibule kakve su i ovdje predložene. U to su se vrijeme, dakle, obje morale nalaziti u osorskoj Zbirci, od kojih je prva naknadno prispjela u AMI u Puli!

<sup>849</sup> Von Sacken wrote (1879: 150) »...und zwei grössere Bogenfibeln aus Bronze 10 und 15 Cm. lang; der Dorn bei beiden an einer Spiralwindung federnd, am Ende des Nuthlappens bei ersterer eine Scheibe, bei letzterer ein lanzettförmiges Blatt, im Tremulirstich verziert...«. This actually testifies that were two such fibulae as presented here. In the past both of them must have been located in the collection in Osor, but only a single one came later in the AMI in Pula!

- 57.** Ulomak dvodijelne brončane zmijaste fibule, sedlasto oblikovanoga luka spuštenog između dvije ravnomjerno postavljene petlje, okruglog presjeka. Luk je ukrašen naizmjenično postavljenim prstenovima/rebrima manjih i većih promjera. Noga je raskovana, četvrtastog presjeka, s petljom kojoj nedostaje disk.  
**Veličina:** duž. 5,4 cm; pr. luka 0,3 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1197  
**Literatura:** Glogović 1982b: Sl. 2: 3; Glogović 1988a: T. III: 1; Glogović 1989: T. 19: 4; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 5: 2; Glogović 2003: 48, T. 47: 358.
- 58.** Ulomak dvodijelne zmijaste fibule. Igla je okruglog oblika glavice, okruglog presjeka, spojena s nogom luka. Luk ima jednu petlju na vrhu i prstenast/rebrast ukras.  
Prema crtežu C. Marchesettia 1924.  
**Veličina:** nedostupna.  
**Literatura:** Marchesetti 1924: Fig. 17; Glogović 1988a: T. III: 2; Glogović 1989: T. 19: 4; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 5: 3; Glogović 2003: 48, T. 47: 362.
- 59.** Ulomak brončane lučne fibule s diskom na nozi. Očuvan je deformiran luk s urezanim ukrasom usporednih linija te spljoštena petlja nožice.  
**Veličina:** duž. 8,8 cm; pr. žice 0,25 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1174  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 60.** Ulomci masivne brončane narukvice manšetastog tipa ravnih krajeva. Rubnici su znatno oštećeni, a sačuvan je dio ravno-ga kraja. Središnjim dijelom narukvice blago je izvučeno 5 rebara. Na rebrima je izveden ukras koso urezanih crtica, a na gornjem rubu ukras šrafiranih trokuta. Narukvica je spojena od 3 dijela od kojih je bio objavljen samo jedan.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,8 cm; vis. 3,4 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 146+1256+BB  
**Literatura:** Glogović 1989: T. 35: 4; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 6: 1 (samo ulomak AZO 146). Ulomci AZO 1256 + BB neobjavljeno
- 61.** Ulomak tanke brončane narukvice manšetastog tipa ravnih krajeva. Izrazito oštećen, sačuvan u 2 dijela. Središnjim dijelom narukvice blago su valovito izvučena 4 rebra, presjek je valovit.  
**Veličina:** duž. 6,5 cm; vis. 4,1 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1029a,b  
**Literatura:** Glogović 1989: T. 35: 5; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 6: 2.
- 62.** Narukvica od tankog brončanog lima, otvorenih krajeva, uvi-jenih, bubrežastih rubova. Oštećena i korodirana.  
**Veličina:** pr. 7 cm; deb. 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 136f  
**Literatura:** Glogović 1982b: Sl. 3: 1; Glogović 1989: T. 37: 6.
- 63.** Narukvica od tankog brončanog lima, otvorenih krajeva, uvi-jenih, bubrežastih rubova. Oštećena i korodirana.  
**Veličina:** pr. 7 cm; deb. 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 136d  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 64.** Narukvica od tankog brončanog lima, otvorenih krajeva, uvi-jenih, bubrežastih rubova. Oštećena i korodirana.  
**Veličina:** pr. 7 cm; deb. 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 136e  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 65.** Narukvica od tankog brončanog lima, otvorenih krajeva, uvi-jenih, bubrežastih rubova. Oštećena i korodirana.  
**Veličina:** pr. 7,7 cm; deb. 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 136b  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 57.** Fragment of a bronze two-part serpentine fibula. It has a saddle-shaped bow lowered between 2 equally positioned loops with a round cross-section. The bow is decorated with alternating thinner and thicker rings/ribs. The foot is hammered it has a square cross-section and finishes with a loop. The disc is missing.  
**Size:** length 5.4 cm; diameter of the bow 0.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1197  
**Literature:** Glogović 1982b: Sl. 2: 3; Glogović 1988a: T. III: 1; Glogović 1989: T. 19: 4; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 5: 2; Glogović 2003: 48, T. 47: 358.
- 58.** Fragment of a two-part serpentine fibula. The pin has a circular head, a round cross-section and is fixed to the foot of the bow. The bow has a single loop on the top and a ring/rib shaped decoration.  
According to the illustration of C. Marchesetti (1924).  
**Size:** not accessible.  
**Literature:** Marchesetti 1924: Fig. 17; Glogović 1988a: T. III: 2; Glogović 1989: T. 19: 4; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 5: 3; Glogović 2003: 48, T. 47: 362.
- 59.** Fragment of a bronze bow fibula with a disc on the foot. Preserved is only the deformed bow decorated with incised parallel lines and a flattened loop of the foot.  
**Size:** length 8.8 cm; diameter of the wire 0.25 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1174  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 60.** Fragments of a massive cuff-shaped bronze bracelet with straight ends. The edges are damaged, preserved is a part of the straight ending. On the central part of the bracelet are 5 low ribs decorated with obliquely incised lines. The upper edge is decorated with hatched triangles. The bracelet was joined from 3 pieces from which only a single one was already published.  
**Size:** length 4.8 cm; height 3.4 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 146+1256+BB  
**Literature:** Glogović 1989: T. 35: 4; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 6: 1 (only fragment AZO 146). Fragments AZO 1256 + BB (with-out numbers) unpublished
- 61.** Damaged fragment of a thin bronze cuff-shaped bracelet with straight ends broken in to 2 pieces. On the central part of the bracelet are 4 low ribs. The cross-section has an undulating profile.  
**Size:** length 6.5 cm; height 4.1 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1029a,b  
**Literature:** Glogović 1989: T. 35: 5; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 6: 2.
- 62.** Damaged and corroded bracelet made from bronze metal sheet. The ends are open and the rolled-in sides create a kidney-shaped cross-section of the bracelet.  
**Size:** diameter 7 cm; thickness 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 136f  
**Literature:** Glogović 1982b: Sl. 3: 1; Glogović 1989: T. 37: 6.
- 63.** Damaged and corroded bracelet made from bronze metal sheet. The ends are open and the rolled-in sides create a kidney-shaped cross-section of the bracelet.  
**Size:** diameter 7 cm; thickness 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 136d  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 64.** Bracelet made from bronze metal sheet. The ends are open and the rolled-in sides create a kidney-shaped cross-section of the bracelet. Damaged and corroded.  
**Size:** diameter 7 cm; thickness 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 136e  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 65.** Bracelet made from bronze metal sheet. The ends are open and

- 66.** Narukvica od tankog brončanog lima, otvorenih krajeva, uvijenih, bubrežastih rubova. Oštećena i korodirana.  
**Veličina:** pr. 7,6 cm; deb. 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 136c  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 67.** Narukvica od tankog brončanog lima, otvorenih krajeva, uvijenih, bubrežastih rubova. Oštećena i korodirana.  
**Veličina:** pr. 8,4 cm; deb. 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 136a  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 68.** Ulomak narukvice od tankog brončanog lima, otvorenih krajeva, uvijenih, bubrežastih rubova. Oštećena i korodirana.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,7cm; šir. 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1287a  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 69.** Ulomak narukvice od tankog brončanog lima, otvorenih krajeva, uvijenih, bubrežastih rubova. Oštećena i korodirana.  
**Veličina:** duž. 2,8 cm; šir. 0,8 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1287b  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 70.** Ulomak narukvice od tankog brončanog lima, otvorenih krajeva, uvijenih, bubrežastih rubova. Oštećena i korodirana.  
**Veličina:** duž. 2,8 cm; šir. 1 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1287c  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 71.** Ulomak narukvice od tankog brončanog lima, otvorenih krajeva, uvijenih, bubrežastih rubova. Oštećena i korodirana.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,8 cm; šir. 0,8 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1287d  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 72.** Velika narukvica od brončane žice, okruglog presjeka, s pridodanim ukrasom od namotane tanke žičice.  
**Veličina:** pr. 8 cm; šir. 0,3 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 419  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 73.** Narukvica od brončane žice, okruglog presjeka, s pridodanim ukrasom od namotane tanke žičice.  
**Veličina:** pr. 6,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 139  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 74.** Velika narukvica od brončane žice, okruglog presjeka, s pridodanim ukrasom od namotane tanke žičice.  
**Veličina:** pr. 6,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 138  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 75.** Ulomak narukvice od brončane žice, okruglog presjeka, s pridodanim ukrasom od namotane tanke žičice.  
**Veličina:** duž. 8 cm; šir. 0,3 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1033  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 76.** Ulomak brončane žice okruglog presjeka s raskovanim i uvijenim krajem, vjerojatno dio narukvice.  
**Veličina:** pr. 4,5 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1032  
**Literatura:** Glogović 1989: T. 38: 2.
- 77.** Ulomak brončane žice okruglog presjeka s dodanim ukrasom od 2 para namotanih žica. Vjerojatno dio narukvice.  
**Veličina:** duž. 7,9 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1033  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 78.** Ulomak brončane žice okruglog presjeka s dodanim ukrasom od 2 para namotanih žica. Vjerojatno dio narukvice.  
**Veličina:** pr. 7,6 cm; deb. 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 136c  
**Literatura:** unpublished
- the rolled-in sides create a kidney-shaped cross-section of the bracelet. Damaged and corroded.  
**Size:** diameter 7.7 cm; thickness 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 136b  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 66.** Bracelet made from bronze metal sheet. The ends are open and the rolled-in sides create a kidney-shaped cross-section of the bracelet. Damaged and corroded.  
**Size:** diameter 7.6 cm; thickness 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 136c  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 67.** Bracelet made from bronze metal sheet. The ends are open and the rolled-in sides create a kidney-shaped cross-section of the bracelet. Damaged and corroded.  
**Size:** diameter 8.4 cm; thickness 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 136a  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 68.** Fragment of a bracelet made from bronze metal sheet. The ends are open and the rolled-in sides create a kidney-shaped cross-section of the bracelet. Damaged and corroded.  
**Size:** length 4.7cm; thickness 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1287a  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 69.** Fragment of a bracelet made from bronze metal sheet. The ends are open and the rolled-in sides create a kidney-shaped cross-section of the bracelet. Damaged and corroded.  
**Size:** length 2.8 cm; thickness 0.8 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1287b  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 70.** Fragment of a bracelet made from bronze metal sheet. The ends are open and the rolled-in sides create a kidney-shaped cross-section of the bracelet. Damaged and corroded.  
**Size:** length 2.8 cm; thickness 1 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1287c  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 71.** Bracelet made from bronze metal sheet. The ends are open and the rolled-in sides create a kidney-shaped cross-section of the bracelet. Damaged and corroded.  
**Size:** length 4.8 cm; thickness 0.8 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1287d  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 72.** Large bracelet made from bronze wire with a round cross-section and added decoration in the form of rolled up thin wire.  
**Size:** diameter 8 cm; thickness 0.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 419  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 73.** Large bracelet made from bronze wire with a round cross-section and added decoration in the form of rolled up thin wire.  
**Size:** diameter 6.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 139  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 74.** Large bracelet made from bronze wire with a round cross-section and added decoration in the form of rolled up thin wire.  
**Size:** diameter 6.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 138  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 75.** Large bracelet made from bronze wire with a round cross-section and added decoration in the form of rolled up thin wire.  
**Size:** length 8 cm; thickness 0.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1033  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 76.** Fragment of a bronze wire with a round cross-section and hammered and rolled-up end. Most probably a part of a bracelet.  
**Size:** diameter 4.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1032  
**Literature:** Glogović 1989: T. 38: 2.

- Veličina:** duž. 7,3 cm. Inv. br.: AZO  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
79. Saltaleone od spiralno namotane tanje brončane žice. Deformiran.  
**Veličina:** duž. 10 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 222a-c  
**Literatura:** Ćus-Rukonić 1981: T. II: 8; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 6: 3.
80. Saltaleone od spiralno namotane tanje brončane žice.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,4 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 223  
**Literatura:** Ćus-Rukonić 1981: T. II: 7; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 6: 3.
81. Saltaleone od spiralno namotane tanje brončane žice.  
**Veličina:** duž. 1,2 cm; šir. do 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1210  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
82. Veći saltaleone od spiralno namotane šire brončane žice, u 7 navoja.  
**Veličina:** duž. 2,7 cm; pr. 2,3 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 261  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
83. Veći saltaleone od spiralno namotane šire brončane žice, u 5 navoja, ukrašen urezanim snopovima od po 4 paralelne linije između kojih su koncentrične kružnice u paru. Oštećenih krajeva.  
**Veličina:** duž. do 1,9 cm; šir. do 2,2 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 276  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
84. Polovica tankog brončanog prstena s ukrasom urezanih šrafi-ranih trokuta između linija uz rubove  
**Veličina:** duž. 2,1 cm; šir. 0,5 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1278  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
85. Prsten od brončanog lima, narebren s preklapljenim krajevima. Gornji i donji rubovi ukrašeni su koso urezanim crticama.  
**Veličina:** duž. 2,1 cm; pr. 2 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 267  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
86. Tri ulomka brončanog tanko narebrenog prstena.  
**Veličina:** vis. 2,3 cm; ukupna duž. 6,4 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1030a,b,c  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
87. Naočalasti privjesak od uvijene brončane žice okruglog presjeka, s raskucanom ušicom sa 3 rupice.  
**Veličina:** duž. 10,5 cm; vis. 7,3 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 135  
**Literatura:** Ćus-Rukonić 1981: T. II: 5; Glogović 1989: T. 39: 1.
88. Naočalasti privjesak od uvijene brončane žice okruglog presjeka. Prema Marchesetti 1924.  
**Literatura:** Marchesetti 1924: 147, Fig. 25.
89. Ulomak brončanog naočalastog privjeska od 4 navoja.  
**Veličina:** pr. 2 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 132  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
90. Ulomak brončanog naočalastog privjeska od 4 navoja.  
**Veličina:** pr. 1,8 cm. Inv. br.: AZO  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
91. Ulomak brončanog kolutastog (sunčevog) privjeska, trokutastog oštrobriidnog presjeka, sa sačuvane dvije unutrašnje prečke i dijelom središnjeg kruga.
77. Fragment of a bronze wire with a round cross-section and added decoration in the form of two pairs of rolled up wires. Most probably a part of a bracelet.  
**Size:** length 7.9 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1033  
**Literature:** unpublished
78. Fragment of a bronze wire with a round cross-section and added decoration in the form of two pairs of rolled up wires. Most probably a part of a bracelet.  
**Size:** length 7.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO  
**Literature:** unpublished
79. Saltaleone from spirally rolled-up thin bronze wire. Deformed.  
**Size:** length 10 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 222a-c  
**Literature:** Ćus-Rukonić 1981: T. II: 8; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 6: 3.
80. Saltaleone from spirally rolled-up thin bronze wire.  
**Size:** length 4.4 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 223  
**Literature:** Ćus-Rukonić 1981: T. II: 7; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: T. 6: 3.
81. Saltaleone from spirally rolled-up thin bronze wire.  
**Size:** length 1.2 cm; thickness to 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1210  
**Literature:** unpublished
82. A larger saltaleoni from rolled-up bronze wire. Consisting of 7 coils.  
**Size:** length 2.7 cm; diameter 2.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 261  
**Literature:** unpublished
83. A larger saltaleoni made from rolled-up bronze wire. Consisting of 5 coils. Decorated with incised sheaves of 4 parallel lines and pairs of concentrically located between them. The ends are damaged.  
**Size:** length do 1.9 cm; width do 2.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 276  
**Literature:** unpublished
84. Half of a thin bronze ring decorated with incised hatched triangles between lines following the edges.  
**Size:** length 2.1 cm; width 0.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1278  
**Literature:** unpublished
85. Ring made from bronze sheet metal. Ribbed with overlapping ends. Upper and lower edges are decorated with obliquely incised lines.  
**Size:** length 2.1 cm; diameter 2 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 267  
**Literature:** unpublished
86. Three fragments of bronze thin ribbed ring.  
**Size:** height 2.3 cm; total length 6.4 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1030a,b,c  
**Literature:** unpublished
87. Spectacle pendant made from bronze wire with a round cross-section and a hammered plate with 3 holes.  
**Size:** length 10.5 cm; height 7.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 135  
**Literature:** Ćus-Rukonić 1981: T. II: 5; Glogović 1989: T. 39: 1.
88. Spectacle pendant made from bronze wire with a round cross-section. According to Marchesetti 1924.  
**Literature:** Marchesetti 1924: 147, Fig. 25.
89. Fragment of a bronze spectacle pendant consisting of 4 coils.  
**Size:** diameter 2 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 132  
**Literature:** unpublished
90. Fragment of a bronze spectacle pendant consisting of 4 coils.

- Veličina:** duž. 3,6 cm; šir. 2,1 cm; deb. 0,2 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 230  
**Literatura:** Glogović 1982b: Sl. 3: 6; Batović 2003: 289.
92. Brončani obručasti privjesci, manjih dimenzija, trokutastog presjeka. Ukupno 43 komada.  
**Veličina:** pr. 1,5 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1274  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
93. Brončana veća karika, s urezanim crticama pri rubu.  
**Veličina:** pr. 5 cm. Inv. br.: AZO  
**Literatura:** Glogović 1982b: Sl. 3: 4.
94. Brončana manja karika.  
**Veličina:** pr. 3,5 cm. Inv. br.: AZO  
**Literatura:** Glogović 1982b: Sl. 3: 7.
95. Tri ulomka većih brončanih karika, s urezanim crticama pri rubu.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4 cm. Inv. br.: AZO  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
96. Ulomak brončane falere tipa *Caput Adriae* (I), sa središnjim trnom i ušicom za prišivanje djelomično očuvanom s unutrašnje strane.  
**Veličina:** duž. 1,9 cm; šir. 1,4 cm; duž. trna 0,8 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1269  
**Literatura:** Blečić Kavur 2012c: 43.
97. Ulomak veće brončane falere tipa *Caput Adriae* (I) s trnom i ušicom za prišivanje, oštećena. Uz rub i po sredini su urezane 3 linije, a oko trna rombični ukras također od 3 urezane linije. Uz donji rub izveden je ukras urezanih trostrukih girlandi.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,5 cm, šir. 3 cm. Inv. br.: AZO  
**Literatura:** Blečić Kavur 2012c: 44, sl. 2.
98. Brončana tuljasta sjekira, dobro očuvana. Rub je zadebljan, bez ušice. Na tijelu tuljca se nalazi ukras "Y" ornamenta sa tri kružna ispupčenja unutar trokuta koji prati liniju "Y" ornamenta. List se pri dnu sužava i potom jednakomjerno raširi u zaobljeno sječivo.  
**Veličina:** duž. 15,6 cm; šir. ruba 5 cm; šir. sječiva: 5,2 cm. Inv. br.: NHMW  
**Literatura:** Batović 1980: T. VII: 11; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 497-498, T. 4: 1; Žeravica 1993: 95, T. 36: 489; Batović 2003: sl. 4: 1.
99. Brončani nož izvijenog sječiva s naglašenim hrptom koji linearno prelazi u trnastu ručku, dijelom oštećenu i polomljenu.  
**Veličina:** duž. 19 cm.  
**Literatura:** Klodič 1885: III-IV, Fig. 13.
100. Urna bikonično oblikovanog tijela, visokog stožastog vrata, naglašenog prijelaza iz zaobljenog ramena u vrat. Na vratu ima urezan ukras od dvije paralelne tanke linije. Stopa je neznatno izvučena, prstenasta i ravna. Rub je naglašeno izvučen, zadebljane i oštre profilacije na prijelazu u vrat. Na gornjoj je strani zaglađen, ali valovitog i neravnomjernog ruba. Jedna ručka prepoznatljiva je samo u odlomljenim dijelovima spoja s posudom, dok je druga očuvana. Postavljena je vertikalno na spoju ramena i donje polovice vrata. Prijelaz iz stope u stijenke posude naglašeno je oštar.
- Size:** diameter 1.8 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO  
**Literature:** unpublished
91. Fragment of a bronze circular pendant (sun-shaped). It has a triangular cross-section and two crossbars and a fragment of the inner circle preserved.  
**Size:** length 3.6 cm; width 2.1 cm; deb. 0.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 230  
**Literature:** Glogović 1982b: Sl. 3: 6; Batović 2003: 289.
92. Smaller bronze ring-shaped pendants with a triangular cross-section. All together 43 pieces.  
**Size:** diameter 1.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1274  
**Literature:** unpublished
93. Larger bronze ring with lines incised along the outer edge.  
**Size:** diameter 5 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO  
**Literature:** Glogović 1982b: Sl. 3: 4.
94. Small bronze ring.  
**Size:** diameter 3.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO  
**Literature:** Glogović 1982b: Sl. 3: 7.
95. Three fragments of larger bronze rings with incised lines along the edges.  
**Size:** length 4 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO  
**Literature:** unpublished
96. Fragment of a bronze phalera of *Caput Adriae* type (I). It has a central protuberance on the upper and a partly preserved loop for fixation on the lower side.  
**Size:** length 1.9 cm; width 1.4 cm; length of the protuberance 0.8 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1269  
**Literature:** Blečić Kavur 2012c: 43.
97. Fragment of a damaged larger phalera of *Caput Adriae* type (I). It has a central protuberance on the upper and a loop for the fixation on the lower side. Long the edge and in the center are incised 3 lines. Around the protuberance is incised a rhomboidal decoration consisting of 3 lines. Along its outer edge is incised a decoration consisting of triple garlands.  
**Size:** length 4.5 cm, width 3 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO  
**Literature:** Blečić Kavur 2012c: 44, sl. 2.
98. Well preserved bronze socketed axe. The mouth is thickened, lacking a loop. The body has a decoration in the form of a "Y" with three circular bulges inside the triangle following the line of the "Y" ornament. The leaf is becoming narrower at the bottom and equally broader at the edge.  
**Size:** length 15.6 cm; width of the mouth 5 cm; width of the edge: 5.2 cm. Inv. nr.: NHMW  
**Literature:** Batović 1980: T. VII: 11; Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989: 497-498, T. 4: 1; Žeravica 1993: 95, T. 36: 489; Batović 2003: sl. 4: 1.
99. Bronze knife with a curved blade with a thickened back passing over in to a tang hilt. Partly damaged and broken.  
**Size:** length 19 cm.  
**Literature:** Klodič 1885: III-IV, Fig. 13.
100. Byconical shaped urn. It has a high cone shaped neck and an accentuated transition from a rounded shoulder in to the neck. On the neck it has an incised decoration of two horizontal thin parallel lines. The base is short, ring shaped and flat. The mouth is everted, thickened and has a sharp transition in to the neck. On the upper side it is smoothed but irregular and with a slightly undulating surface. One handle is broken and only parts are preserved while the second one is complete. It is located vertically on the transition

Keramika je srednje zrnata s primjesama kvarcitnog pijeska, šamota i kalcijeva karbonata, s vanjske strane zaglađena i polirana, a s unutarnje prilično neravnomjerne teksture. Površina urne na dijelovima je nagorena, oštećena i isprana, pa se, izuzev prevladavajuće sivosmeđe boje, na dijelovima izmjenjuju i nijanse narančastosmeđe i crne boje.

**Veličina:** vis. 27 cm; šir. ramena 29 cm; šir. izvučenog ruba 5,5 cm; pr. stope 8 cm; deb. stijenke 3-5 mm, ručka: vis. 7 cm; šir. 3 cm. Inv. br.: AZO 1874

**Literatura:** Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013: Fig. 3-4.

## KASTAV – Crekvina

**Nalaz:** Sporadični nalazi iz uništenih grobova prapovijesne nekropole, nađeni prilikom nadzora infrastrukturnih radova. Građa se čuva u PPMHP u Rijeci.

**101.** Naočalasta fibula sa osmicom. Nije sačuvana.

**Literatura:** Matejčić 1981: 63; Guštin 1987: 34; Blečić 2002: 86.

**102.** Ulomak posude/urne tipa kanelirane šalice, s visokim suženim vratom i zaobljenim trbuhom. Ukrašen je izveden kosim kanelurama po gornjem dijelu trbuha. Tamnosmeđa keramika, fino polirana s vrlo malo primjesa kalcita.

**Veličina:** duž. 5,6 cm; šir. 3,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ CR. 1979

**Literatura:** Matejčić 1981: 63; Matejčić 1983: 50; Blečić 2002: Prilog/Sl. 3.

**103.** Ulomak zdjele razgrnutog oboda i zaobljenog trbuha. S vanjske strane ukrašena je plitkim žlijebljenim horizontalnim linijama ispod ruba posude te valovitim usporednim linijama na tijelu. S unutarnje strane ruba, na jezičasto izvučenom dijelu ruba, izveden je ukras ispupčenja s koncentričnim kaneliranim kružnicama. Keramika je tankih stijenki i tamnosmeđe boje.

**Veličina:** duž. 22,5 cm; šir. 6,2 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ CR. 1979

**Literatura:** Starac 1991: T. XXVII: 7.

## PODOSOJNA PEĆ

**Nalaz:** Špilja se nalazi uz desnu stranu kanjona Mošćeničke Drage kod sela Potoki, a istraživana je tijekom kampanja 1987. i 1988. godine. Veći dio građe objavljen je<sup>850</sup> i pohranjen u PPMHP u Rijeci.

**104.** Tirkiznoplava staklena perla, spljoštena s izrazito profiliranim okcima od provučene bijele niti.

**Veličina:** pr. 2,8 cm.

**Literatura:** Starac 1991; Starac 1994: 22, Prilog XIII: 5; Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2014: Fig. 5.

**105.** Usko spiralno savijena brončana traka-saltaleone trokutastog presjeka.

**Veličina:** duž. 5,7 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

**106.** Ulomak keramičke šalice zaobljenog trbuha, ravnog dna i izdignute trakaste ručke.

from the shoulder in to the lower part of the neck. The transition from the base in to the belly is sharp. The medium grained pottery contains additives of quartzite sand, fireclay and calcium carbonate. The outer side is smoothed and polished; the inner has a relatively irregular texture. The surface is partly burned, damaged and eroded. The dominant color is grayish-brown with partly changing shades of yellowish-brown and black.

**Size:** height 27 cm; width of the shoulder 29 cm; width of the everted rim 5.5 cm; diameter of the base 8 cm; thickness of the wall 3-5 mm, handle: height 7 cm; width 3 cm. Inv. nr.: AZO 1874

**Literature:** Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013: Fig. 3-4.

## KASTAV – Crekvina

**Discovery:** Sporadic finds of destroyed graves, most probably a part of the prehistoric necropolis, discovered during works on the infrastructure. They are kept in the PPMHP in Rijeka.

**101.** Spectacle fibula with an loop in the form of number eight. It is not preserved.

**Literature:** Matejčić 1981: 63; Guštin 1987: 34; Blečić 2002: 86.

**102.** Fragment of a grooved cup with a high narrowed neck and rounded belly. The decoration in the form of oblique grooves is located on the upper part of the belly. It is made from polished dark brown pottery with a little bit of calcium carbonate added.

**Size:** length 5.6 cm; width 3.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ CR. 1979

**Literature:** Matejčić 1981: 63; Matejčić 1983: 50; Blečić 2002: Prilog/Sl. 3.

**103.** Fragment of a bowl with a rounded belly. On the outer side it is decorated with shallow horizontal grooves below the mouth and undulating parallel lines on the body. On the inner side of the mouth, on the tongue-like extension is located the decoration in the form of protuberances with concentricall grooves. Thin walled pottery of dark brown color.

**Size:** length 22.5 cm; width 6.2 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ CR. 1979

**Literature:** Starac 1991: T. XXVII: 7.

## PODOSOJNA PEĆ

**Discovery:** The cave is located on the right side of the canyon of Mošćenička Draga near the village of Potoki. It was excavated in 1987 and 1988. A large part of the finds were published.<sup>850</sup> They are kept in the PPMHP in Rijeka.

**104.** Turquoise-blue glass bead. It has a flattened form with profiled eyes made from white tread.

**Size:** diameter 2.8 cm.

**Literature:** Starac 1991; Starac 1994: 22, Prilog XIII: 5; Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2014: Fig. 5.

**105.** Narrow spirally rolled-up bronze band – a saltaleoni with a triangular cross-section.

**Size:** length 5.7 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

**Literature:** unpublished

**106.** Fragment of a ceramic cup with a rounded belly, straight bottom and an elevated band-shaped handle.

<sup>850</sup> Starac 1991; Starac 1994.

<sup>850</sup> Starac 1991; Starac 1994.

**Veličina:** pr. trbuha 6,2 cm; vis. 5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 107.** Ulomak zaobljenog trbuha keramičke šalice s izdignutom trakastom ručkom koja se prema vrhu sužava. Ispod ručke nalazi se žlijebli ukrašen dvije girlande. Keramika je siva do crna, fino polirana i tankih stijenki.

**Veličina:** duž. 6,5 cm; šir. 6 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 108.** Ulomak zaobljenog trbuha keramičke šalice s izdignutom trakastom ručkom koja se prema vrhu sužava. Ispod ručke nalazi se žlijebli ukrašen od tri viseće usporedne polukružne linije. Keramika je siva do crna, tankih stijenki i fino polirana.

**Veličina:** duž. 6,2 cm; šir. 6,3 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 109.** Ulomak vrata veće keramičke posude ukrašen sa tri horizontalne kanelure ispod kojih se na ramenu nalazi veće ispupčenje okruženo sa pet kanelura. Keramika je siva do crna, tankih stijenki i fino polirana.

**Veličina:** duž. 13 cm; šir. 8,6 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 110.** Ulomak ramena keramičke posude ukrašen sa tri horizontalne kanelure ispod kojih je ukrašen od pet koncentričnih kanelura. Keramika je siva do crna, tankih stijenki i fino polirana.

**Veličina:** duž. 8 cm; šir. 9,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 111.** Ulomak izvijenog vrata veće keramičke posude ukrašen sa tri horizontalno žlijeblije linije. Na vratu se nalaze trokutasti i polukružni motivi od po tri žlijeblije linije i po tri kružna udubljenja na vrhu. Keramika je siva do crna, tankih stijenki i fino polirana.

**Veličina:** duž. 18,7 cm; šir. 12 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 112.** Ulomak trbuha keramičke posude ukrašen sa tri horizontalne žlijeblije linije, ispod kojih je urezan trokutasti motiv od po tri usporedne linije.

**Veličina:** duž. 7,5 cm; šir. 7 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 113.** Veća keramička zdjela razgrnutog i blago zadebljanog ruba, zaobljenog trbuha i ravnog dna. Trakasta, vertikalno i ukošeno postavljena ručka nalazi se ispod ruba posude.

**Veličina:** vis. 10,5 cm; pr. otvora 26,3 cm; pr. dna 8,7 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 114.** Ulomak veće keramičke zdjele razgrnutog i s unutrašnje strane facetiranog ruba. Trbuh je zaobljen. Veća trakasta i perforirana ručka spaja rub i trbuh posude.

**Veličina:** duž. 13,8 cm; šir. 13,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 115.** Ulomak većeg keramičkog lonca, blago izvijenog i s unutrašnje strane facetiranog ruba. Na vratu se nalazi ukrašen od četiri horizontalno žlijeblije linije. Masivna horizontalna ručka poligonalnog je presjeka postavljena na trbuhu.

**Veličina:** duž. 20 cm; šir. 17 cm; duž. ručke 13,7 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 116.** Veći keramički lonac, očuvan djelomično, izvijenog je ruba i zaobljenog trbuha sa dvije vertikalno postavljene ručke

**Size:** diameter of the belly 6.2 cm; height 5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 107.** Fragment of a rounded belly of a cup with an elevated band-shaped handle getting narrower towards the top. Below the handle is grooved the decoration of two garland shaped grooves. The pottery has a gray to black polished surface and thin walls.

**Size:** length 6.5 cm; width 6 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 108.** Fragment of a rounded belly of a cup with an elevated band-shaped handle getting narrower towards the top. Below the handle is grooved the decoration of three garland shaped grooves. The pottery has a gray to black polished surface and thin walls.

**Size:** length 6.2 cm; width 6.3 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 109.** Fragment of the neck of a larger ceramic vessel decorated with three horizontal grooves below which are located on the shoulder a larger wart surrounded with five grooves. The pottery has a gray to black polished surface and thin walls.

**Size:** length 13 cm; width 8.6 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 110.** Fragment of the shoulder of a ceramic vessel decorated with three horizontal grooves below which is the decoration of five concentric grooves. The pottery has a gray to black polished surface and thin walls.

**Size:** length 8 cm; width 9.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 111.** Fragment of an everted neck of a larger ceramic vessel decorated with three horizontal grooves. On the neck are located triangular and semicircular motives of three grooves and three circular deepening on top. The pottery has a gray to black polished surface and thin walls.

**Size:** length 18.7 cm; width 12 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 112.** Fragment of the belly of a ceramic vessel decorated with three horizontal grooves below which is incised a triangular motive made from three parallel lines.

**Size:** length 7.5 cm; width 7 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 113.** Larger ceramic bowl with a slightly thickened rim, rounded belly and flat bottom. A band like vertically placed handle is located below the rim.

**Size:** height 10.5 cm; diameter of the mouth 26.3 cm; diameter of the bottom 8.7 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 114.** Fragment of a larger bowl with faceted inner side of the mouth. The belly is rounded. A larger band like and perforated handle links the belly and the mouth of the bowl.

**Size:** length 13.8 cm; width 13.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 115.** Fragment of a larger ceramic pot with a slightly everted and on the inner side faceted mouth. On the neck is located the decoration composed of four horizontal grooves. A massive horizontal handle with a polygonal cross-section is attached to the belly of the pot.

**Size:** length 20 cm; width 17 cm; length of the handle 13.7 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ *Podosojna*

- 116.** A partly preserved larger ceramic pot with an everted mouth, rounded body and two vertically placed handles connecting the belly and the neck of the vessel. On the center of the belly



koje su spajale vrat i trbuh posude. Po sredini trbuha ukras je kraćih i neravnomjernih plitkih kanelura.

**Veličina:** duž. 17,5 cm; šir. 10 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ Podosojna

117. Keramička mala pekva kosih stjenki s istakom na vrhu.

**Veličina:** pr. 11,2 cm; vis. 3,2 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ Podosojna

**Literatura:** Starac 1991; Starac 1994: 20-23, Prilog X-XIII.

## BAKAR – Kaštel

**Nalaz:** prilikom zaštitnih radova u unutrašnjosti Kaštela u Bakru, na najnižim razinama slojeva iznad matične stijene, istraženi su ulomci prapovijesne keramike iz kasnog brončanog i željeznog doba sa jednom iglom čavličasto oblikovane glavice. Građa se čuva u PPMHP Rijeka.

118. Brončana igla čavličasto oblikovane male glave i neukrašenog vrata. Iгла nedostaje.

**Veličina:** duž. 18 cm; pr. glavice 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19225

**Literatura:** Starac 2005: 166.

## PODBADANJ

**Nalaz:** S lokacije Podbadanj kod Crikvenice pojedinačni nalaz navodno potječe iz ostave u kojoj je bilo ukupno 13 vrhova koplja.

119. Vrh brončanog malog koplja, vrlo dobro očuvanog lovoraštog oblika lista. Težište lista je izrazito nisko i tekućeg prijelaza u široki okrugli tuljac. Sa strana se nalaze dvije rupice za pričvršćivanje.

**Veličina:** duž. 10,2 cm; šir. 2,8 cm; pr. tuljca 2,1 cm. Privatna zbirka Drago Crnić

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

## OPOROVINA

**Nalaz:** Špilja Oporovina nalazi se s desne strane kanjona Medveje ispod zaseoka Oraj. Istraživana je u više arheoloških kampanja, ali je vrh koplja kao pojedinačni nalaz nađen pribijen u procijep zida matične stijene poviše ulaza u lijevi, sporedni kanal prilikom istraživačke kampanje 1988. godine. Građa se čuva u PPMHP Rijeka.

120. Vrh brončanog prilično oštećenog koplja, plamenastog oblika lista, profiliranog, stepenastog presjeka i tekućeg prijelaza u tuljac. Tuljac za nasad je cilindričan, a na listu lagano spljošten.

**Veličina:** duž. 12 cm; pr. tuljca 1,6 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19222

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

## RIJEKA

**Nalaz:** U PPMHP pod inventarnom oznakom *Stari fond* čuva se dio arheološke građe bez preciznijih podataka o okolnostima nalaženja. Jedini poznati podatak, kako stoji u staroj inventarnoj knjizi, je da potječu iz Rijeke, eventualno s lokacija

is a decoration in the form of short irregular grooves.

**Size:** length 17.5 cm; width 10 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ Podosojna

117. A small ceramic baking lid with oblique walls and a protuberance on top.

**Size:** diameter 11.2 cm; height 3.2 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ Podosojna

**Literature:** Starac 1991; Starac 1994: 20-23, Prilog X-XIII.

## BAKAR – Kaštel

**Discovery:** During the conservation works in the interior of the Kaštel in Bakar in two lowest levels above the bedrock, archaeological strata were discovered included fragments of prehistoric pottery dated to the Late Bronze and Iron Age. A single bronze pin with a nail-shaped head was discovered. The finds are kept in the PPMHP Rijeka.

118. Bronze pin with a small nail-shaped head and undecorated neck. The pin is missing.

**Size:** length 18 cm; diameter of the head 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19225

**Literature:** Starac 2005: 166.

## PODBADANJ

**Discovery:** On the locality of Podbadanj near Crikvenica was allegedly discovered a hoard in which 13 spear points were discovered. Only a single example is preserved.

119. Small well preserved bronze spear point with a laurel-shaped blade. The point of gravity is located extremely low and has a fluent transition in to the circular shaft. On the side of the shaft are two holes for the fixation of the spear point.

**Size:** length 10.2 cm; width 2.8 cm; diameter of the shaft 2.1 cm. Privatne collection Drago Crnić

**Literature:** unpublished

## OPOROVINA

**Discovery:** The Oporovina cave is located on the right side of the Medveja canyon below the hamlet of Oraj. It was excavated in several campaigns, but the spear point was discovered as an individual find discovered rammed in to a crack of the wall above the entrance in to the left, parallel, tunnel during the excavation in 1988. It is kept in PPMHP Rijeka.

120. A rather damaged bronze spear point. It has a flame shaped blade, a profiled, step shaped cross-section and smooth transition in to the shaft. The shaft is cylindrical, a little bit flattened on the blade.

**Size:** length 12 cm; diameter of the shaft 1.6 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 19222

**Literature:** unpublished.

## RIJEKA

**Discovery:** In PPMHP are stored as *The old fund* archaeological finds lacking detailed information about their discovery. The only information present, as noted in the old inventory book is, that they were discovered on the territory of Rijeka, eventually on the sites ex Via Verneda and ex Via Ciotta, which is the location of the

ex Via Verneda i ex Via Ciotta, što su položaji prapovijesne, antičke i srednjovjekovne nekropole Rijeke. Dio predmeta je sasvim bez podataka, pa nije isključeno da potječu iz šire riječke okolice ili čak nekih drugih nalazišta koji su se nalazili pod ingerencijama tadašnjeg *Museo Civico* iz Rijeke.<sup>851</sup> Pretpostavlja se kako je to samo dio zbirke, od koje je većina vjerojatno otpremljena u Italiju, tijekom i nakon Drugog svjetskog rata. Unatoč takvoj problematičnosti podrijetla pojedinih predmeta u ovome se katalogu obrađuju skupno pod nalazište *Rijeka*.

- 121.** Brončana igla s glavicom u obliku kuglice bez ukrasa. Igla je okruglog presjeka i završava zašiljenim krajem.

**Veličina:** duž. 1,3 cm; pr. glavice 1,6 cm; pr. igle 0,2 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 995

**Literatura:** Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 8: 2.

- 122.** Brončana igla s raskovanom glavicom, pločastog presjeka i povišenog vrata. Igla je ravna i zašiljena na kraju, okruglog presjeka.

**Veličina:** duž. 10,8 cm; deb. 0,3 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 996

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

- 123.** Brončana savijena igla, raskovane i prema unutra savijene glavice u jednom navoju. Igla je okruglog presjeka i nedostaje zašiljeni kraj. Raskovani navoj plosnatog je presjeka.

**Veličina:** duž. 5,3 cm; deb. igle 0,3 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1001

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

- 124.** Ulomak brončane naočalaste fibule tipa Haslau-Regelsbrunn. Sačuvan je disk od 6 navoja spiralne žice okruglog presjeka koja završava izvučenom žicom savijenom prema van, kvadratnog presjeka.

**Veličina:** pr. 6,2 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1008

**Literatura:** Glogović 2003: 23, T. 13: 129.

- 125.** Ulomak brončane naočalaste fibule tipa Haslau-Regelsbrunn(?), s diskom od pet navoja spiralne žice, okruglog presjeka.

**Veličina:** pr. 3,9 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1010

**Literatura:** Glogović 2003: 24, T. 13: 131.

- 126.** Ulomak brončane naočalaste fibule tipa Haslau-Regelsbrunn(?), s manjim diskom sa 6 navoja spiralne žice, okruglog presjeka.

**Veličina:** pr. 4,6 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1007

**Literatura:** Glogović 2003: 24, T. 13: 130.

- 127.** Ulomak brončane naočalaste fibule tipa Haslau-Regelsbrunn(?), vrlo oštećen komad sa sačuvana samo 3 polomljena navoja spiralne žice, okruglog presjeka.

**Veličina:** pr. 3,8 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1009

**Literatura:** Glogović 2003: 24, T. 13: 132.

prehistoric, roman and medieval necropolis of Rijeka. A part of the finds, completely lacking any information could also originate from the broader region around Rijeka or even from other sites which were under the supervision of the *Museo Civico* from Rijeka.<sup>851</sup> It is assumed that this is only a part of the collection which was during and after the II World War transferred to Italy. Despite the uncertainty of their origins individual finds will be considered as originating from a site designated as Rijeka.

- 121.** Bronze pin with an undecorated circular head. The pointed pin has a round cross-section.

**Size:** length 1.3 cm; diameter of the head 1.6 cm; diameter of the pin 0,2 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 995

**Literature:** Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 8: 2.

- 122.** Bronze pin with a flattened head. It has a flat cross-section and a rolled up neck. The pointed pin has a round cross-section.

**Size:** length 10.8 cm; thickness 0.3 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 996

**Literature:** unpublished

- 123.** Bent bronze pin. It has a flattened and in to the inner side rolled up head. The pin has a round cross-section and the point is missing.

**Size:** length 5.3 cm; thickness 0.3 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1001

**Literature:** unpublished

- 124.** Fragment of a bronze spectacle fibula of the Haslau-Regelsbrunn type. Preserved is a single disc with 6 coils of wire with a round cross-section which ends with a wire with a square cross-section.

**Size:** diameter 6.2 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1008

**Literature:** Glogović 2003: 23, T. 13: 129.

- 125.** Fragment of a bronze spectacle fibula of the Haslau-Regelsbrunn type(?). It has a smaller disc and 5 coils of wire with round cross-section.

**Size:** diameter 3.9 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1010

**Literature:** Glogović 2003: 24, T. 13: 131.

- 126.** Fragment of a bronze spectacle fibula of the Haslau-Regelsbrunn type(?). It has a smaller disc and 6 coils of wire with round cross-section.

**Size:** diameter 4.6 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1007

**Literature:** Glogović 2003: 24, T. 13: 130.

- 127.** Fragment of a bronze spectacle fibula of the Haslau-Regelsbrunn type(?). The damaged fragment has only 3 broken coils with a round cross-section preserved.

**Size:** diameter 3.8 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1009

**Literature:** Glogović 2003: 24, T. 13: 132.

<sup>851</sup> Npr. Raffaello Battaglia navodi kako je u Trnovu kod Ilirske Bistrice vršio istraživanja s kolegama i tadašnjim direktorom Riccardom Giganteom iz "Arheološkog muzeja" u Rijeci i da je dio građe otpremljen u taj isti Muzej (Battaglia 1927: 93). Međutim, činjenica je da takvih podataka u inventarnim knjigama PPMHP nedostaje. Riječki su muzealci bili na tim područjima u zaleđu Rijeke angažirani samo u službi zaštite i tzv. inspekcije, dok su prava istraživanja provodili upravo kolege iz tršćanskog Muzeja i Zavoda. Uostalom, kako je rečeno, dio je građe otpremljen u Italiju, gdje joj se gubi svaki trag pa eventualno tako i nalazima iz Trnova. No najvažnije je svakako navesti da R. Battaglia nije u pogledu ovih podataka, kao ni u vrijednosti brojnih drugih vezanih uz samo arheološku građu, najpouzdaniji izvor!

<sup>851</sup> For example Raffaello Battaglia mentions that he conducted research in Trnovo near Ilirska Bistrica with his collaborators and the director Riccardo Gigante from the "Archaeological museum" in Rijeka. He also mentions that a part of these finds was transferred to the same museum (Battaglia 1927: 93). But it is a fact that these informations do not exist in the inventory books of the PPMHP. The employees of the museum from Rijeka were active on these territories only in terms of rescue excavations or inspection while the systematic research was conducted by the specialists from the Museum and Monument conservation office from Trieste. As already mentioned a part of these finds was transferred to Italy where its whereabouts is unknown – the same goes for the finds from Trnovo. At the same time we have to keep in mind that R. Battaglia is, in connection to these informations, as well as in many others not only linked to archaeological finds, not an trustworthy source!

- 128.** Brončana lučna jednopetljasta fibula s tordiranim lukom i raskovanom trokutastom uvijenom nožicom. Presjek luka i igle je okrugli, a petlje rombični.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,7 cm; vis. 3,3 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 999  
**Literatura:** Glogović 1989: 18, T. 17: 3; Glogović 2003: 16, T. 10: 58.
- 129.** Masivna brončana polumjesečasta jednopetljasta fibula tipa *Caput Adriae*, oštećena. Luk je polukružnog oblika i ravnog, pločastog presjeka. Na jednoj strani je stanjen i okruglog presjeka i prelazi u oprugu koja nije sačuvana. S druge strane sačuvan je samo uvijeni, raskovani dio luka koji je bio nosačem igle, polukružnog presjeka.  
**Veličina:** duž. 13,8 cm; vis. 9,5 cm; vis. luka 1,3 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1082  
**Literatura:** Glogović 2003: 67, T. 53: 501.
- 130.** Velika brončana polumjesečasta jednopetljasta fibula tipa *Caput Adriae*, oštećena. Dio luka je napuknut u dva dijela, polukružnog oblika s polumjesečastim proširenjem čiji su vanjski rubovi jako oštećeni, a unutrašnji savijeni i potpuni. Nožica je oblika niskog raskovanog trokuta, uvijena i polukružnog presjeka. Opruga i igla nedostaju.  
**Veličina:** duž. 12,4 cm; vis. 9,5 cm; vis. luka 2,2 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1081  
**Literatura:** Glogović 2003: 67, T. 53: 502.
- 131.** Naočalasti privjesak od brončane žice u 3 navoja, izrazito izdignute ušice za pričvršćivanje, kružnog presjeka. Privjesak se nalazi pričvršćen brončanom žicom kružnog presjeka za predmet neodređene namjene.  
**Veličina:** duž. 2,5 cm; šir. 2 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1079  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 132.** Usko spiralno savijena brončana traka-saltaleone trokutastog presjeka.  
**Veličina:** duž. 6 cm; vis. 0,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1067a,b  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 133.** Usko spiralno savijena brončana traka-saltaleone trokutastog presjeka.  
**Veličina:** duž. 2,7 cm; šir. 0,1 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1068  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 134.** Usko spiralno savijena brončana traka-saltaleone trokutastog presjeka.  
**Veličina:** duž. 8,7 cm; šir. 0,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1069  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 135.** Usko spiralno savijena brončana traka-saltaleone trokutastog presjeka.  
**Veličina:** duž. 7,7 cm; šir. 0,6 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1070a,b  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 136.** Velika brončana narukvica izrazito naglašenog dvoslivnog presjeka sačuvana u cijelosti, oštećenih rubova.  
**Veličina:** pr. 7,9 cm; šir. 0,8 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1048  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- 128.** Bronze bow fibula with a single loop with a twisted bow and a hammered triangular shaped bent foot. The bow and the pin have a round while the loop has a rhomboid cross-section.  
**Size:** length 4.7 cm; height 3.3 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 999  
**Literature:** Glogović 1989: 18, T. 17: 3; Glogović 2003: 16, T. 10: 58.
- 129.** Massive bronze damaged crescent-shaped fibula with a single loop of the *Caput Adriae* type. The damaged bow has a semi-circular form and a flat cross-section. On one side it is thinned and has a round cross-section changing in to the coil which is missing. On the other side is preserved only the bent hammered part of the bow which was the attachment of the pin which has a semicircular cross-section.  
**Size:** length 13.8 cm; height 9.5 cm; height 1.3 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1082  
**Literature:** Glogović 2003: 67, T. 53: 501.
- 130.** Massive bronze damaged crescent-shaped fibula with a single loop of the *Caput Adriae* type. Part of the bow is cracked in to two pieces. It has a semicircular form with a crescent-shaped widening with damaged outer borders while the inner ones are bent and preserved. The foot has the form of a low hammered triangle; it is bent and has a semicircular cross-section.  
**Size:** length 12.4 cm; height 9.5 cm; height of the bow 2.2 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1081  
**Literature:** Glogović 2003: 67, T. 53: 502.
- 131.** Spectacle pendant made of bronze with 3 coils. It has an elevated sling for fixation and a round cross-section. It is fixed with a bronze wire with a round cross-section to an unidentified item.  
**Size:** length 2.5 cm; width 2 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1079  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 132.** Coiled up bronze band-saltaleoni with a triangular cross-section.  
**Size:** length 6 cm; width 0.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1067a,b  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 133.** Coiled up bronze band-saltaleoni with a triangular cross-section.  
**Size:** length 2.7 cm; width 0.1 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1068  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 134.** Coiled up bronze band-saltaleoni with a triangular cross-section.  
**Size:** length 8.7 cm; width 0.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1069  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 135.** Coiled up bronze band-saltaleoni with a triangular cross-section.  
**Size:** length 7.7 cm; width 0.6 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1070a,b  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 136.** Large bronze bracelet within a double-pitch cross-section – completely preserved but with damaged edges.  
**Size:** diameter 7.9 cm; width 0.8 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1048  
**Literature:** unpublished
- 137.** Damaged fragment of a bronze bracelet with a double-pitch cross-section.  
**Size:** diameter 6.1 cm; width 0.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1047  
**Literature:** unpublished

- I 37.** Oštećen ulomak brončane narukvice naglašenog dvoslivnog presjeka.  
**Veličina:** pr. 6,1 cm; šir. 0,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1047  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 38.** Ulomak brončane narukvice blago zadebljanog dvoslivnog presjeka.  
**Veličina:** pr. 7,6 cm; šir. 0,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1044  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 39.** Ulomak manje brončane narukvice dvoslivnog blažeg i zadebljanog presjeka.  
**Veličina:** duž. 7,5 cm; šir. 0,8 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1045  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 40.** Trakasta brončana narukvica C plosnatog presjeka, oštećena, napuknuta na 4 dijela. Rekonstruirana.  
**Veličina:** pr. 5,3 cm; šir. 0,4 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1048  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 41.** Trakasta brončana narukvica, sa sačuvana 2 ulomka C spljoštenog presjeka.  
**Veličina:** pr. 4,5 cm, šir. 0,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1049  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 42.** Brončani prsten trokutastog presjeka dobro očuvan, bez ukrasa.  
**Veličina:** pr. 2,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1028  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 43.** Brončani prsten trokutastog presjeka, oštećen i savinute brončane trakice.  
**Veličina:** pr. 2,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1030  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 44.** Brončani prsten trokutastog presjeka, oštećenih rubova i izlizan.  
**Veličina:** pr. 2,5 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1029  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 45.** Kalotasto brončano dugme s ušicom za prišivanje i jednom rupicom na površini.  
**Veličina:** pr. 1,9 cm; vis. 0,4 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1034  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 46.** Okruglo konveksno brončano dugme, ukrašeno sa 14 kuglica iskucanih na donjem dijelu toke i rupicom na vrhu.  
**Veličina:** pr. 3,2 cm; vis. 1,3 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1037  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 47.** Okruglo konveksno brončano dugme, oštećen, ukrašen kao prethodno.  
**Veličina:** duž. 3,2 cm; šir. 2,1 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1038  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 48.** Ulomak brončane falere polukružnog presjeka s ušicom za prišivanje s unutrašnje strane koja je ukrašena punciranim koncentričnim kružnicama. Površina je ukrašena iskucanim kružićima, ukupno četiri vidljiva.  
**Veličina:** duž. 3,3 cm; šir. 2,7 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1039  
**Literatura:** neobjavljeno
- I 49.** Veliko okruglo brončano dugme polukružnog presjeka, s
- I 38.** Fragment of a bronze bracelet with a slightly thickened double-pitch cross-section.  
**Size:** diameter 7.6 cm; width 0.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1044  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 39.** Fragment of a small bronze bracelet with a less marked and thickened double-pitch cross-section.  
**Size:** length 7.5 cm; width 0.8 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1045  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 40.** Band like bronze bracelet with a C shaped cross-section. It is damaged and cracked in to 4 pieces. It is reconstructed.  
**Size:** diameter 5.3 cm; width 0.4 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1048  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 41.** Two preserved fragments of a band like bracelet with a C shaped flattened cross-section.  
**Size:** diameter 4.5 cm, width 0.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1049  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 42.** Bronze ring with a triangular cross-section. Undecorated and well preserved.  
**Size:** diameter 2.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1028  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 43.** Bronze ring with a triangular cross-section. It is damaged and bent.  
**Size:** diameter 2.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1030  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 44.** Bronze ring with a triangular cross-section. It is worn and its edges are damaged.  
**Size:** diameter 2.5 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1029  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 45.** Calotte-shaped bronze button with a sling for fixation and a small hole on the surface.  
**Size:** diameter 1.9 cm; height 0.4 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1034  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 46.** Round bronze convex button. It is decorated with 14 hammered globules on the lower side and a small hole on the upper.  
**Size:** diameter 3.2 cm; height 1.3 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1037  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 47.** Round bronze convex damaged button. It is decorated with 14 hammered globules on the lower side and a small hole on the upper.  
**Size:** length 3.2 cm; width 2.1 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1038  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 48.** Fragment of a bronze phalerae with a semicircular cross-section and a sling for fixation on the inner side. The surface is decorated with concentric circles from which only four are clearly visible.  
**Size:** length 3.3 cm; width 2.7 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1039  
**Literature:** unpublished
- I 49.** Large round bronze button with a semicircular cross-section. It has a sling for fixation. Its edges are damaged.  
**Size:** diameter 4.5 cm; height 1.1 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1035

ušicom za prišivanje. Rubovi su oštećeni, a površina glatka, bez ukrasa.

**Veličina:** pr. 4,5 cm; vis. 1,1 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1035

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

- 150.** Veliko okruglo brončano dugme polukružnog presjeka, s ušicom za prišivanje, izrazito oštećena.

**Veličina:** pr. 4,3 cm; vis. 0,9 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1036

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

- 151.** Široko ovalna posuda tipa *skiphos* ciparske produkcije (*Whait painted Cypriot 1*), sačuvana u cijelosti ali na više mjesta napuknuta i rekonstruirana. Svijetlokeramika sa svijetložutim premazom, oslikana crnom mat bojom. Koničnog je donjeg dijela tijela, prstenaste male noge i s parom tek malo izvučenih ručki. Cijela je površina trbuha ukrašena sa dvije crne horizontalne oslikane trake, u gornjem i donjem dijelu trbuha. Između njih, sa svake strane, nalazi se središnji motiv križa unutar dva snopa od po 7 okomito postavljenih tankih linija. Unutrašnjost je oslikana debljom rubnom trakom tamnocrvene boje, središnji dio tijela sa četiri tanke horizontalne linije, a dno sa pet tankih linija.

**Veličina:** vis. 12,4 cm; pr. ruba 16 cm; pr. dna 6,4 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 80

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

## RAB Gromačica

**Nalaz:** Zaštitno istraživanje uništene nekropole pod tumulima na Loparu, prilikom drobljenja kamenja i izradbe temelja turističkog naselja San Marino, obavila je R. Matejčić 1967. godine. U tumulima je bilo više skeletnih ukopa u kamenim škrinjama, vjerojatno u zgrčenom položaju, s velikim poklopnica. Nađeni su dijelovi nošnje i oružja, a keramika u potpunosti nedostaje.

### Grob 7

- 152.** Velika brončana igla s diskasto oblikovanom glavicom i sa 2 kružna zadebljanja na vratu. Igla je savijena, okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog kraja.

**Veličina:** duž. 26 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 404

- 153.** Brončani mač sačuvanog sječiva istanjenog rombičnog presjeka i istaknutog središnjeg rebra. Uz rubove oštrica paralelno su urezane po 3 do 4 linije, koje se sijeku pri samom kraju sječiva, tj. na vrhu oštrice. Ploča za nasad trokutastog je oblika sa 3 rupice i sačuvanom jednom zakovicom. Pri samom vrhu, koji je odlomljen, završava četvrtastom šire izvedenom jezičastom istakom, s asimetrično postavljenom rupicom. Sječivo i ploča za nasad rukohvata prilično su loše ušćuvani.

**Veličina:** duž. 28 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 411

- 154.** Okov korica mača konične je forme i elipsoidnog presjeka tijela. U donjem se dijelu nalazi kuglasto profilirano zadebljanje, okruglog presjeka istake i pločasta baza. Ukras paralelno urezanih linija izveden je po tijelu okova, a sa 4 istake na središnjem kuglastom zadebljanju.

**Veličina:** duž. 7,7 cm. Inv. br.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 410

**Literatura:** Matejčić 1968: 75-84, T. VI-IX; Batović 1980: 36-37; Glogović 1989: T. 6: 2, 5; T. 28: 6; Harding 1995: 17, 105, T. 2: 15; T. 45 A30; Mihovilić 2001b: 174-175, T. 2: 5-7.

**Literature:** unpublished

- 150.** Large round damaged bronze button with a semicircular cross-section. It has a sling for fixation.

**Size:** diameter 4.3 cm; height 0.9 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 1036

**Literature:** unpublished

- 151.** A vessel of the skyphos type of Cypriote origin (*White painted Cypriot 1*). Completely preserved, cracked and reconstructed. Light brown pottery with a lightly yellow slip painted with a black color. The lower portion of the vessel is conical. It has small ring shaped foot and a pair of handles. The surface of the belly is decorated with two horizontal bands in the lower and upper part of the body. Between them on each side is located a motive of a cross between two sheaves of 7 vertical thin lines. The inner side is painted on the mouth with a thicker dark red line, the central part with 4 and the bottom with 5 thin horizontal lines.

**Size:** height 12.4 cm; diameter of the mouth 16 cm; diameter of the bottom 6.4 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 80

**Literature:** unpublished

## RAB Gromačica

**Discovery:** Rescue excavation of a tumulus necropolis on Lopar. It was discovered in 1967 by R. Matejčić during stone crushing and building of the San Marino touristic resort. The tumuli included several skeletal burials, most probably in crouched position, buried in stone chests with large coverings. Discovered were elements of attire and weapons while pottery is completely missing.

### Grave 7

- 152.** Large bronze pin with a disc shaped head and 2 circular thickenings on the neck. The pin has a round cross-section and a bent pointed end.

**Size:** length 26 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 404

- 153.** Bronze sword with a thinned rhombic cross-section and a narrow central rib. Parallel to the blade are running 3 to 4 incised lines meeting at the end of the blade on its tip. The hilt plate has a triangular form and 3 holes with a single rivet preserved. It is broken and it ends with a square part of the tang with an asymmetrically positioned hole. The blade and the hilt are badly preserved.

**Size:** length 28 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 411

- 154.** Metal plating of the sword sheath. It has a conical form and ellipsoid cross-section. On the lower part is a circular thickening and the end has the form of a plate. On the thickening there are 4 protuberances. Its body is decorated with incised lines.

**Size:** length 7.7 cm. Inv. nr.: PPMHP AO-PPZ 410

**Literature:** Matejčić 1968: 75-84, T. VI-IX; Batović 1980: 36-37; Glogović 1989: T. 6: 2, 5; T. 28: 6; Harding 1995: 17, 105, T. 2: 15; T. 45 A30; Mihovilić 2001b: 174-175, T. 2: 5-7.

## Katalog nalaza iz Pretpovijesnog odjela AMZ

T. 1

### KRK Garica

**Nalaz:** Uništeni tumuli iz dijela nekropole s duljim kontinuitetom sahranjivanja od ranog brončanog do antičkog doba. Š. Ljubić publicira građu koju je sam prikupio prilikom istraživanja 1874. godine i onu koju je dobio na poklon od mještana.<sup>852</sup> U tri istražena tumula zabilježio je pokopavanje s incineracijom, dok su svi ostali precizniji podatci su nepoznati. Građa je pohranjena u AMZ-u, a neznatni dio nalazi se u ŽZD na Vrbniku. Ipak, znatan broj predmeta koji se nalazi na prvom popisu građe iz Garice kojeg je Š. Ljubić objavio još 1876. godine nije evidentiran u AMZ-u.

**155.** Velika brončana igla, lukovičasto oblikovane glavice s profiliranom kružnom istakom na vrhu koja je udubljena. Na vratu se nalazi tanko prstenasto zadebljanje koje prelazi u bikonično profilirano zadebljanje četvrtastog presjeka. Na najvećem je dijelu vrat zadebljan i gusto koso tordiran. Vrat prelazi u suženu iglu, okruglog presjeka, kojoj nedostaje zašiljeni kraj.

**Veličina:** duž. 14,8 cm; pr. glavice 1,5 cm; pr. vrata 0,5cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5648

**156.** Brončana igla, puno lijevane konkavne glavice zaravnjenog vrha, varijante igle tipa Velika Gorica. Vrat je kratak, naglašeno zadebljan, četvrtastog presjeka s velikim spiralno uvijenim žljebovima. Igla je sužena, okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog kraja. Poklon odvjetnika Petra Brušića 1874. godine.

**Veličina:** duž. 14,1 cm; pr. glavice 0,6 cm; pr. vrata 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5649

**157.** Velika brončana igla sa spiralno uvijenom glavicom, od jednog navoja, polomljena u gornjoj trećini igle. Glavica je blago raskovana u širini igle, pločastog presjeka, a igla je ravna, okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog kraja.

**Veličina:** duž. 17,3 cm; šir. glavice 0,3 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5651-2

**158.** Velika brončana igla sa spiralno uvijenom glavicom, od jednog navoja. Glavica je trapezasto raskovana, pločastog presjeka, a igla je ravna, okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog kraja.

**Veličina:** duž. 16 cm; šir. glavice 0,8 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5651-1

**159.** Manja brončana igla-ukosnica, bikoničnog oblika glave, igle okruglog presjeka.

**Veličina:** vis. 8,5 cm, pr. glavice 0,9 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5650

**160.** Veća brončana, lučna jednopetljasta fibula s trapezasto raskovanim i iskucavanjem ukrašenom nožicom s vanjske i unutrašnje strane. Luk je okruglog presjeka, s ukrasom urezanih geometrijskih motiva; snopovi paralelnih urezanih linija (9) izmjenjuju se s urezanim motivom borovih grančica (10). Luk završava raskovnom oprugom od jednog navoja, rombičnog presjeka. Na nožici je s prednje strane iskucan polukružni ornament od dva reda

<sup>852</sup> Ljubić 1876; Ljubić 1889.

## Catalogue of finds from the Prehistoric department of AMZ

T. 1

### KRK Garica

**Discovery:** Destroyed tumuli from a necropolis with a long continuation of burials ranging from the Early Bronze Age to Roman antiquity. Š. Ljubić published the finds collected in 1874 and the finds received from the local population.<sup>852</sup> Cremation graves were discovered in three excavated tumuli. All other information's are unknown. Finds are preserved in AMZ in while a minor part is preserved in ŽZD in Vrbnik. Still a large part of the finds listed in the first inventory of finds from Garica published by Š. Ljubić in 1876 is missing.

**155.** Large bronze pin with an onion-shaped head which has a profiled ending on the top with a small hollow. On the neck is a small ring-shaped thickening changing in to a byconical thickening with a square cross-section. The neck is thickened and obliquely twisted. The pin has a round cross-section and its tip is missing.

**Size:** length 14.8 cm; diameter of the head 1.5 cm; diameter of the neck 0.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5648

**156.** Bronze pin with a small head with a flat end, local variant of pins of the Velika Gorica type. The neck is short and thickened. It has a square cross-section with large twisted grooves. The pin is thinned; it has a round cross-section and a pointed end. It was donated by the lawyer Petar Brušić in 1874.

**Size:** length 14.1 cm; diameter of the head 0.6 cm; diameter of the neck 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5649

**157.** Large bronze pin with a spirally rolled-up head. It is broken on its upper third. The head is hammered and has a square cross-section. The pin is straight with a round cross-section and has a pointed end.

**Size:** length 17.3 cm; width of the head 0.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5651-2

**158.** Large bronze pin with a spirally rolled up head. The head is hammered; it has a square cross-section and a trapezoidal form. The pin is straight with a round cross-section and has a pointed end.

**Size:** length 16 cm; width of the head 0.8 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5651-1

**159.** A smaller bronze pin. It has a byconical-shaped head. The pin is straight with a round cross-section and has a pointed end.

**Size:** length 8.5 cm, diameter of the head 0.9 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5650

**160.** Larger bronze single loop bow fibula with a trapezoidal hammered and with embossing decorated foot. The bow has a round cross-section and is decorated with geometrical motives – sheaves of incised parallel lines are exchanged with incised ornaments in the form of a pine twig. The bow ends with a spring with a rhomboidal cross-section. On the foot is

<sup>852</sup> Ljubić 1876; Ljubić 1889.

točkica (20), a s unutrašnje strane isti je izveden ornament ali u obliku valovnice s većom točkom u sredini. Iгла nedostaje.

**Veličina:** vis. 13 cm, vis. 8 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5645<sup>853</sup>

- 161.** Ulomak brončane fibule sa spiralno namotanim lukom od žice okruglog presjeka namotanog u niz od 4 trostrukih međusobno povezanih zavojnica. Noga prelazi u disk, pravokutnog presjeka, sačuvanog u vanjskoj spirali. Opruga je očuvana jednim navojem, igla nedostaje.

**Veličina:** duž. 6,2 cm; vis. 1,3 cm; pr. diska 1,4 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-20534<sup>854</sup>

- 162.** Ulomak dvodijelne brončane zmijske fibule, sedlasto oblikovanoga luka spuštenog između dvije ravnomjerno postavljene petlje. Očuvana je petlja prema glavi fibule, okruglog presjeka žice. Luk je široko raskovan u rombičnu pločicu, plosnato-narebnog presjeka. Po gornjoj strani luka ukrašen je sa 2 istaknuta paralelna rebra, po kojima je izveden motiv duboko urezanih crtica. Završava suženom nogom luka, ukrašenom urezanim usporednim linijama, s četvrtasto profiliranim klinom kojim je pričvršćena na iglu. Iгла je lukovičasto oblikovane glavice ukrašena sa dvije deblje iscrtkane linije uz donji i gornji rub glavice. Vrat je okruglog presjeka sa 3 blago profilirana kuglasta zadebljanja i prelazi u prošireno četvrtasto perforirano zadebljanje u kojeg je pričvršćen luk. Iгла je ravna, okruglog presjeka i bez zašiljenog završetka. Noga i nosač igle nedostaju.

**Veličina:** duž. 8,3 cm; vis. 2,9 cm; pr. glavice igle 1,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15979

- 163.** Naočalasti privjesak od brončane savijene žice, okruglog presjeka. Privjesak je polomljen i deformirano rastegnuto u ušici za pričvršćivanje.

**Veličina:** max. duž. 8 cm; pr. spirale 2,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15988

- 164.** Ulomak masivne brončane narukvice manšetastog tipa, ravnih krajeva. Uz kut rubnika na gornjem dijelu nalazi se nepravilna rupica. Rubnici su sa svih strana blago izvučeni i zaravnjeni te se na vanjskim rubovima nalazi cik-cak ukras od po 6 koso paralelnih linija. Središnjim dijelom narukvice teče 5 širih usporednih rebara kojima se djelomično sačuvao ukras od koso urezanih crtica cijelom širinom rebra.

**Veličina:** duž 5,7 cm; šir. 4,2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15980

- 165.** Masivna brončana narukvica manšetastog tipa, znatno oštećena i patinirana. Krajevi su pri završetcima spiralno uvijeni prema vanjskoj strani. Rubnici su oštećeni, ali na očuvanim dijelovima ravni i oštri. Središnjim dijelom narukvice teče 10 tankih usporednih rebara, koja se ne prostiru do krajeva rubnika.

**Veličina:** duž. 22,1 cm; šir. 5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15985

- 166.** Veća brončana ukrasna alka ovalnog spljoštenog presjeka.

**Veličina:** pr. 3,7 cm; deb. 0,8 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15983

on the front side embossed a crescent-shaped ornament consisting of two lines of dots while on the inner side, the same ornament is made in the form of a undulating line with a larger dot in the middle. The pin is missing.

**Size:** length 13 cm, height 8 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5645<sup>853</sup>

- 161.** Fragment of a bronze fibula with spirally coiled up bow made from wire with a round cross-section. It is coiled up in to a series of 4 triple linked coils. The foot ends in a disc of rectangular cross-section preserved in the outer spiral. Only a single loop of the spring is preserved, the pin is missing.

**Size:** length 6.2 cm; height 1.3 cm; diameter of the disc 1.4 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-20534<sup>854</sup>

- 162.** Fragment of a two-part serpentine fibula with a saddle-shaped bow lowered between two parallel loops. The loop towards the head of the fibula has a circular cross-section of the wire. The bow is flat forged in to a rhomboidal plate. Its upper side is decorated with 2 parallel ribs decorated with incised lines. It ends with a narrowed foot, decorated with incised parallel lines, with a wedge with a square cross-section, fixing the pin. The pin has an onion shaped head decorated with two thicker hatched lines located on the lower and upper edge of the head. The neck has a round cross-section with 3 slightly profiled thickening a thickened part with a square opening through which the bow is fixed. The pin is straight, has a round cross-section and the point if missing. The foot is missing.

**Size:** length 8.3 cm; height 2.9 cm; diameter of the head of the pin 1.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15979

- 163.** Bronze spectacle pendant with a round cross-section. The pendant is fragmented and deformed in the middle.

**Size:** max. length 8 cm; diameter of the spiral 2.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15988

- 164.** Fragment of a massive bronze cuff-shaped bracelet with straight ends. The edges are slightly curved and flattened and on the outer side decorated with zigzag ornaments consisting of 6 oblique running parallel lines. On the central part of the bracelet are 5 parallel ribs with partly preserved decoration of obliquely incised lines running on the whole surface of the rib.

**Size:** length 5.7 cm; width 4.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15980

- 165.** Massive bronze cuff-shaped bracelet. Damaged and patinated. The ends are spirally rolled up towards the outer side. The edges are damaged but on the preserved parts straight and sharp. On the surface of the bracelet are visible 10 thin parallel running ribs ending before the end of the bracelet.

**Size:** length 22.1 cm; width 5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15985

- 166.** Larger bronze ring with a flattened cross-section.

**Size:** diameter 3.7 cm; thickness 0.8 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15983

<sup>853</sup> Navedena se fibula iz nekog nepoznatog razloga našla u objavi pod lokalitetom *Krbavica* (Drechsler-Bižić 1976: T. III: 1), iako ju već i Š. Ljubić (1876: 36, kat. H-a5) publicira pod lokalitetom *Garica* gdje ju je uostalom i sam istražio!

<sup>854</sup> Navedena se fibula iz nekog nepoznatog razloga našla u objavi pod lokalitetom *Grižane* (Batović 1981: 94, Sl. 2: 4; Batović 1983: 310, T. XLV: 4; Glogović 2003: 22, T. 13: 116), iako ju već i Š. Ljubić (1876: 41, T. IV: 5; 1889: T. XXXIII: 263) publicira pod lokalitetom *Garica* gdje ju je uostalom, kao i prethodnu, sam istražio! Ta je nepažnja, i opetovano ponavljanje pogreške, uvelo čitavu pomutnju u znanstvenoj literaturi, što se ponajviše odražava u kulturološkim interpretacijama (vidjeti u tekstu; npr. Pare 1998: 328-329; König 2004a: 132).

<sup>853</sup> The mentioned fibula was due to an unknown reason published as belonging to the site of *Krbavica* (Drechsler-Bižić 1976: T. III: 1), although it was already Š. Ljubić (1876: 36, cat. H-a5) who published it as coming from *Garica* where he discovered it by himself!

<sup>854</sup> The mentioned fibula was due to an unknown reason published as belonging to the site of *Grižane* (Batović 1981: 94, Sl. 2: 4; Batović 1983: 310, T. XLV: 4; Glogović 2003: 22, T. 13: 116), although it was already Š. Ljubić (1876: 41, T. IV: 5; 1889: T. XXXIII: 263) who published it as coming from *Garica* where he discovered it, as also the previous one, by himself! This recklessness and the repeating reproduction of a mistake created a disorder in the literature reflected mostly in cultural interpretations (see in the text; for example Pare 1998: 328-329; König 2004a: 132).

**167.** Brončano veliko kalotasto dugme, oštih rubova, s unutrašnjom ušicom za prišivanje.

**Veličina:** pr. 3,7 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15984

**168.** Dva ulomka brončane britve. Sječivo je sačuvano u gornjem rubu ravnoga hrpta, raskovanog pločastog presjeka. S obje strane nalazi se ukras punciranih koncentričnih kružnica. Kružnice su raspoređene u nepravilna dva reda. Sa stražnje strane, prvi je red kružnica od jednog kruga i središnje točkice. Ručica je tanka i tordirana, rombičnog presjeka, završava prstenastim zaključkom sa 2 roščića.<sup>855</sup>

**Veličina:** duž. sječiva 3,8 cm, šir. sječiva 3,7 cm; duž. ručkice 5,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15995+5644

**169.** Ulomak brončanog srpa s naglašenim i zaobljenim hrptom koji se svija prema oštrici. Sječivo je oštećeno i savijeno k oštrici.

**Veličina:** duž. 9,7 cm; šir. 2,3 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5643

**170.** Amorfn komad bronce.

**Veličina:** duž. 2,2 cm; šir. 1,3 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15989-2

**171.** Okruglo jantarno zrno, spljoštenih krajeva, s rupicom za provlačenje.

**Veličina:** pr. 2,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15990

**Literatura:** Ljubić 1876: 10 kat. A3, 11 kat. D1-2, 15 kat. L1, 15 M2, 27 kat. R6, R9, 28 kat. R14, 28 kat. B1-3, 29 kat. C-a3-5, 30 kat. C-b1, 31 kat. D-b6-7, 32 kat. D-d6, 33 kat. D-f2, 33 kat. D-h1, 36 kat. H-a5, 37 kat. H-c2, 41 kat. H-f14, 43 kat. H-h 9-10, 44 kat. H-i5-6, 46 kat. H10-12, 48 kat. Y9, T. III: 20-21, 27; IV: 5; Stare 1957b: T. III: 5; Batović 1980: VI: 11; Batović 1983: 312; Drechsler-Bižić 1962: Tab. I: 1; Glogović 1988a: T. II: 3; Glogović 1989: T. 5: 2, T. 18: 6; T. 19: 3, T. 34: 4, T. 35: 6-7; Weber 1996: 256, T. 55: 618; Batović 2003: Sl. 3: 2-3, Sl. 6: 1-3; Glogović 2003: 14, 47, T. 7: 42, T. 47: 356; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 9; 10.

## T. 2

### GRIŽANE

**Nalaz:** Slučajni nalaz mača koji je bio pribijen u pukotinu stijene u grižanskom kamenolomu 1902. godine. Precizniji podatci nisu poznati.

**172.** Brončani mač s punom kovinskom ručkom balčaka oblika čaše, jednostavne forme, dobro očuvan, s oštećenim vrhom sječiva. Balčak je ravan, ovalnog presjeka s uglatim masivno izvučenim rebrima ravnomjerno postavljenima duž visine balčaka. Sva 3 zadebljanja po sredini imaju ukrasno tanko rebro. Na prijelazu u čašu ornamentiran je motivom borovih grančica i paralelno urezanim linijama. Čaša je polukružna i duboka, dijelom oštećena i savijena, ukrašena s obje strane. S vanjske strane urezana su 3 reda paralelnih linija, a s unutarnje strane čaše nalazi se gljivasto ispupčenje ukrašeno ponovljenim motivom borovih grančica i paralelnih linija. Držak se trokutasto proširuje prema sječivu, s dvije zakovice na krajevima. Sječivo je izvijeno, uz balčak znatno suženo, s *ricasso* ukrasom od 6 urezanih girlandi, a u donjem dijelu zaobljeno i prošireno prema vrhu. Uz rubove donjega dijela urezane su dvije dublje kanelure koje prate sječivo i sijeku se

**167.** Bronze calotte-shaped button with sharp edges and a sling on the inner side.

**Size:** diameter 3.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15984

**168.** Two fragments of a bronze semilunate razor. The upper part of a straight back of the blade is preserved. It is decorated on both sides with punctuated decorations of two concentric circles with a point in the center arranged in two irregular lines. On the back side the first line is composed of only a single circle with a point in the center. The handle is thin, with a rhomboidal cross-section, and twisted. It ends with a circular ring with two horns.<sup>855</sup>

**Size:** length of the blade 3.8 cm, width of the blade 3.7 cm; length of the handle 5.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15995+5644

**169.** Fragment of a bronze sickle with a thickened back. The blade is damaged.

**Size:** length 9.7 cm; width 2.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5643

**170.** Amorphous bronze fragment.

**Size:** length 2.2 cm; width 1.3 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15989-2

**171.** Circular amber bead with flattened ends and a hole in the middle.

**Size:** diameter 2.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15990

**Literature:** Ljubić 1876: 10 cat. A3, 11 cat. D1-2, 15 cat. L1, 15 M2, 27 cat. R6, R9, 28 cat. R14, 28 cat. B1-3, 29 cat. C-a3-5, 30 cat. C-b1, 31 cat. D-b6-7, 32 cat. D-d6, 33 cat. D-f2, 33 cat. D-h1, 36 cat. H-a5, 37 cat. H-c2, 41 cat. H-f14, 43 cat. H-h 9-10, 44 cat. H-i5-6, 46 cat. H10-12, 48 cat. Y9, T. III: 20-21, 27; IV: 5; Stare 1957b: T. III: 5; Batović 1980: VI: 11; Batović 1983: 312; Drechsler-Bižić 1962: Tab. I: 1; Glogović 1988a: T. II: 3; Glogović 1989: T. 5: 2, T. 18: 6; T. 19: 3, T. 34: 4, T. 35: 6-7; Weber 1996: 256, T. 55: 618; Batović 2003: Sl. 3: 2-3, Sl. 6: 1-3; Glogović 2003: 14, 47, T. 7: 42, T. 47: 356; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 9; 10.

## T. 2

### GRIŽANE

**Discovery:** Chance find of a sword which was driven in to a crack in the rock in the Grižane stone quarry. It was discovered in 1902. Precise information about the discovery is not known.

**172.** Bronze sword with a solid grip and cup-shaped end. It is well preserved with damaged end of the blade. The grip is straight; it has an oval cross-section with three thickenings in the form of ribs equally distributed on the surface. All of them have a thin rib in the middle. On the beginning of the cup-shaped terminal it is decorated with a motive of a pine twig and parallel incise lines. The cup is semi-circular and deep, partly damaged and bent and decorated on both sides. On the outer side it is decorated with 3 rows of parallel lines. On the inner side, is a bulge decorated with the motive of pine twig and parallel lines. The grip widens slightly from the cup towards the blade, with two rivets on his ends. The blade is curved, on the side of the handle narrower. It has a *ricasso* decoration of 6 incised garlands. Towards the tip it is getting broader. Along the edges are incised 2 deeper grooves following the blade, coming together at its tip. The central rib is broad, massive and clearly pronounced.

**Size:** length 41.7 cm; thickness of the blade 3 cm; diameter of the hilt 2.1 cm; diameter of the cup 4.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-6574

<sup>855</sup> Š. Ljubić ulomak ručkice publicira kao iglu od ostruge? (Ljubić 1881: 15 kat. L1).

<sup>855</sup> Š. Ljubić published the fragment of the handle as a pin from a spur? (Ljubić 1881: 15 cat. L1).



prema njegovom vrhu. Središnje je rebro istaknuto, široko i masivno.

**Veličina:** duž. 41,7 cm; deb. sječiva 3 cm; pr. balčaka 2,1 cm; pr. čaše 4,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-6574

**Literatura:** Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 162-169, Sl. 1a-b; Batović 1980: Sl. 20: 2, T. 44: 2a-c; Glogović 1989: 14, T. 11: 2; Harding 1995: 79, T. 32: 249.

## T. 2-3

### TRIBALJ = Grižane

**Nalaz:** U AMZ-u čuva se nalaz nekoliko nakitnih predmeta nošnje, iz uništenog tumula, koje je našao župnik, vlč. Balaš na području Triblja i poklonio ih Muzeju. Skupni je nalaz u stručnoj literaturi konvencionalno zadržan pod nalazištem Grižane, iako je pogrešno uveden, na što su upozoravali još i J. Brunšmid i R. Matejčić. Š. Batović objavljuje nalaz kao *grobnu cijelinu*.<sup>856</sup> Da je doista riječ o više tumula, koji su se nalazili ispod Grižana, dakle i u Triblju, svjedoče i podaci navedeni kod Š. Ljubića, koji pak navodi kako je nalaze Muzeju poklonio grižanski kapelan C. Gruber, koji je zapravo predmete samo donio u AMZ.<sup>857</sup> Riječ je, međutim, o igli s okruglom (*lukovičastom*, op.a.) glavicom i djelomično očuvanom iglom, o dvije lučne fibule sa dva dugmeta na luku, jednoj zmijastoj fibuli te, zasebno, o fibuli tipa Certosa i o dva prstena.<sup>858</sup>

- 173.** Brončana sjekira sa zaliscima tipa Guntramsdorf, u potpunosti očuvana, s urezanim inicijalima posjednika: "MM". Sjekira ima glatki gornji dio tijela s kratkim zaliscima, podignutog presjeka, ravnog tjemena i stepenastog prijelaza u sječivo.

**Veličina:** duž. 21,2 cm; šir. zaliska 2,7; šir. sječiva 4,9 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-2034

- 174.** Brončana lučna fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku, djelomično izlizana i patinirana. Luk je okruglog presjeka, sa 2 diskasta dugmeta i s ukrasom urezanih geometrijskih motiva. Snopovi paralelnih linija formiraju metopna polja, koja su ispunjena različitim ornamentom. Prva i druga metopa, iznad dugmeta sa svake strane, su prazne. U trećoj metopi urezan je motiv nasuprotno postavljenih girlandi, u četvrtoj metopi urezani su po tri reda naizmjenično šrafiranih rombova, dok je središnje metopno polje, na najvišem dijelu luka, ukrašeno urezanim rombovima. Ispod dugmeta urezana su 4 snopa paralelnih linija, bez ispuna metopnih površina. Luk završava velikom, raskovanom oprugom od jednog navoja, rombičnog presjeka, koja prelazi u iglu, okruglog presjeka. Nožica je raskovana, trokutasta i bez ukrasa.

**Veličina:** duž. 24,8 cm; vis. 14,4 cm; pr. luka 0,6 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-20529

- 175.** Dvodijelna brončana zmijasta fibula, sedlasto oblikovanoga luka spuštenog između dvije neravnomjerno postavljene petlje. Luk je četvrtastog presjeka, ukrašen geometrijskim ornamentom urezanih linija koje čine naizmjenične i neprekinute nizove trokuta, na vanjskim rubovima. Završava četvrtasto profiliranim uskim klinom kojim je spojen s iglom. Noga je pravokutnog presjeka, završava diskom od 3 navoja. Iglu, lukovičastog oblika glavice, okruglog je presjeka vrata na kome se nalazi disk ukrašen urezanim crticama. Slijedi

**Literature:** Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 162-169, Sl. 1a-b; Batović 1980: Sl. 20: 2, T. 44: 2a-c; Glogović 1989: 14, T. 11: 2; Harding 1995: 79, T. 32: 249.

## T. 2-3

### TRIBALJ = Grižane

**Discovery:** In AMZ are kept several pieces of attire, coming from a destroyed tumulus, which were discovered by rvd. Balaš on the territory of Tribalj and donated to the Museum. In literature the assemblage was conventionally kept under the name Grižane and wrongly entered in to the inventory as a grave, as already mentioned by J. Brunšmid and R. Matejčić.<sup>856</sup> Š. Ljubić mentioned the existence of several tumuli in Tribalj below Grižane, but he noted that the finds were brought in to the AMZ by the vicar from Grižane C. Gruber.<sup>857</sup> These were a pin with an oval (onion-shaped) head and a partly preserved pin, two bow fibulae with two knobs on the bow, a serpentine fibula, and, individually, a Certosa type fibula and two finger rings.<sup>858</sup>

- 173.** Bronze axe with wings of the Guntramsdorf type. Completely preserved with incised initials of the possessor: "MM". It has a straight upper part of the body with short elevated wings, as straight butt and a step like transition in to the blade.

**Size:** length 21.2 cm; width of the wings 2.7; width of the blade 4.9 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-2034

- 174.** Bronze bow fibula with two knobs on the bow. Partly eroded and patinated. The bow has a round cross-section thickening towards the spring. Two disc shaped knobs are decorated with incised geometric motives. Sheaves of parallel lines shape metope fields filled with different ornaments. First and second metopes on each side above the knob are empty. The third metope has an incised motive of opposing garlands while the fourth includes incised three rows of alternating hatched rhombs. Below the button are incised 4 sheaves of parallel lines without fillings of the metope fields. The bow ends with a large spring with a single coil with a rhombic cross-section proceeding in to a pin with a circular cross-section. The foot is thinned, triangular in shape and not decorated.

**Size:** length 24.8 cm; height 14.4 cm; thickness of the bow 0.6 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-20529

- 175.** Two-part serpentine fibula with a saddle shaped bow positioned between two irregularly placed coils. The bow has a square cross-section and is decorated with geometric ornament of incised lines forming alternately continuous lines of triangles located on outer edges of the bow. It ends with a squarely profiled narrow wedge which is linked to the pin. The foot has a square cross-section ending with a disc with 3 coils. The pin, with an onion-shaped head, has a round cross-section of the neck on which is a disc decorated with incised lines. It is followed by a thickening with a square hole in to which the bow of the fibula is fixed. The pin has a sound cross-section and a pointed end.

**Size:** length 13.1 cm; height 3.6 cm; thickness of the bow 0.4 cm; diameter of the disc 2 cm; diameter of the head of the pin 1.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-20530

- 176.** Well preserved 9 bracelets with a double-pitch cross-section mad from bronze sheet metal.

<sup>856</sup> Batović 1981: 94; Batović 1983: T. XLV: 1-4.

<sup>857</sup> Brunšmid 1901: 57, f.n. 3.

<sup>858</sup> Ljubić 1876: 28-29, 33-34, 36-37, 39.

<sup>856</sup> Batović 1981: 94; Batović 1983: T. XLV: 1-4.

<sup>857</sup> Brunšmid 1901: 57, f.n. 3.

<sup>858</sup> Ljubić 1876: 28-29, 33-34, 36-37, 39.

četrvtasto perforirano zadebljanje u kojeg je pričvršćen luk fibule. Igla je okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog završetka.

**Veličina:** duž. 13,1 cm; vis. 3,6 cm; deb. luka 0,4 cm; pr. diska 2 cm; pr. glavice igle 1,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-20530

- 176.** Narukvice od brončanog iskucanog lima, dvoslivnog presjeka, oštrih bridova. Ukupno 9 dobro očuvanih primjeraka.

**Veličina:** pr. koluta 7,3-8,2 cm, šir. 0,5-0,9 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-20531

**Literatura:** Ljubić 1876: 28 kat. B4, 29 kat. C1-2, 33 kat. D-i1, 34 kat. D-l2, 36 kat. H-a2-3, 37 kat. H-C1, 39 kat. H-d14; T. III: 24; Ljubić 1889: 71-72, 166, T. X: 35, 36, T. XXXIII: 263; Brunšmid 1901: 57, f. n. 3; Batović 1980: T. VII: 2; Batović 1981: 94, Sl. 2: 3-4; Batović 1983: T. XLV: 1-4; Glogović 1988a: T. II: 6, Sl. 1: 2; Glogović 1989: T. 14: 3, T. 19: 1, T. 36; Žeravica 1993: 68, T. 18: 226; Pare 1998: Abb. 16; Glogović 2003: 9, 22, 47, T. 1: 8, T. 13: 116, T. 47: 357.

#### T. 4

### KASTAV – Lokvina

**Nalaz:** Skeletni ukop u kamenoj škrinji s priloženim polomljenim mačem, nepoznatih poblizih podataka. Grob je nađen slučajem, prilikom gradnje temelja učiteljske škole na Lokvini 1931. godine, unutar grada Kastva. AMZ-u darovala ga je ista škola 1933. godine.

- 177.** Brončani mač s punom kovinskom ručkom balčaka oblika čaše, jednostavne forme, prelomljen na tri dijela. Balčak je zadebljan i gladak, ovalnog presjeka, ukrašen s tri reda usporrednih linija. Na prijelazu u čašu, s vanjske je strane, između linija urezan jednostruki motiv borovih grančica. Čaša je polukuglastog oblika, plitka s ispupčenjem u središtu, ukrašeno motivom zvijezde konkavnih stranica, obrubljene koncentričnim krugovima i vijencem kosih crta. Uz rub čaše urezane su dvije usporedne linije, a dio vanjskog ruba čaše je i oštećen. Držak se trokutasto proširuje prema sječivu, ukrašen s usporednim linijama. Sječivo je na prvom trećini izrazito suženo, a u drugoj zaobljeno prošireno prema šiljku. Rubni dio sječiva, koji je prilično oštećen, prati ukras od tri paralelne linije. Središnje rebro je naglašeno i masivno.

- 178.** Dijelovi okova korica mača. Okov gornjeg otvora ukrašen je nizom tekućih lukova izvedenih u dva reda urezanih linija i uz rub sa dva reda punciranih točkica, dok je okov vrha korica bez ukrasa i bez šiljka.

**Veličina:** duž. 47,1 cm; deb. sječiva 3 cm; pr. balčaka 2,4 cm; pr. čaše 4,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-10468

**Literatura:** Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 162-169, Sl. 2a-e; Batović 1980: T. 8: 1-1a; Batović 1983: Sl. 20: 2, T. 44: 2a-c; Glogović 1989: 13, T. 11: 1; Harding 1995: 78, T. 31: 244; Blečić 2002: 99-100, T. 1: 11; Pare 2008: 87, Fig. 5.9 B5; Barbarić 2009: 316, Fig. 6: 3.

#### T. 4

### KRALJEVICA

**Nalaz:** Pod nalazištem Kraljevica, u AMZ-u je označena igla koja je navodno bila nađena u špilji Šiljevici na Oštru. Igla je poklon, bez podataka o okolnostima nalaza.

- 179.** Ulomak brončane igle s bikoničnom, na vrhu spljoštenom i kaneliranom glavicom. Gornji dio glavice manji je od donjeg, a dijeli ih najdeblja središnja kanelura ukrašena kosim urezi-

**Size:** diameter 7.3 to 8.2 cm, width 0.5 to 0.9 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-20531

**Literature:** Ljubić 1876: 28 cat. B4, 29 cat. C1-2, 33 cat. D-i1, 34 cat. D-l2, 36 cat. H-a2-3, 37 cat. H-C1, 39 cat. H-d14; T. III: 24; Ljubić 1889: 71-72, 166, T. X: 35, 36, T. XXXIII: 263; Brunšmid 1901: 57, f. n. 3; Batović 1980: T. VII: 2; Batović 1981: 94, Sl. 2: 3-4; Batović 1983: T. XLV: 1-4; Glogović 1988a: T. II: 6, Sl. 1: 2; Glogović 1989: T. 14: 3, T. 19: 1, T. 36; Žeravica 1993: 68, T. 18: 226; Pare 1998: Abb. 16; Glogović 2003: 9, 22, 47, T. 1: 8, T. 13: 116, T. 47: 357.

#### T. 4

### KASTAV - Lokvina

**Discovery:** Skeletal burial in a stone chest lacking any detailed information's. A broken sword was discovered in the grave. The grave was discovered during the erection of foundations for the teacher's training school on Lokvina in the city of Kastav in 1931. It was donated by the school to the AMZ in 1933.

- 177.** Bronze sword with a cast hilt and a simple cup-shaped terminal. It was broken in to three parts. The hilt is thickened and smooth - it has an oval cross-section and is decorated with three rows of parallel lines. On the transition in to the cup, on the outer side is, between the lines, incised the motive of pine twig. The cup has a semicircular shape; it is shallow with a knob in the middle. The latter is decorated with a motive in the shape of a star with concave sides, surrounded with concentric circles and a wreath of oblique lines. Beside the edge of the cup are incised two parallel lines, while the outer side of the cup is damaged. The grip widens slightly from the cup towards the blade, decorated with parallel lines. The first third of the blade is narrow while the second third becomes broader towards the tip. Edges, which are rather damaged, are decorated with three parallel lines. The central rib is massive and accentuated.

- 178.** Parts of metal plating of the sheets. The metal plate of the mouth is decorated with a string of arches made from two rows of incised lines and along the edge with two lines of pierced points. The metal plate of the type is not decorated and lacks the point.

**Size:** length 47.1 cm; width of the blade 3 cm; diameter of the hilt 2.4 cm; diameter of the cup 4.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-10468

**Literature:** Vinski-Gasparini 1970: 162-169, Sl. 2a-e; Batović 1980: T. 8: 1-1a; Batović 1983: Sl. 20: 2, T. 44: 2a-c; Glogović 1989: 13, T. 11: 1; Harding 1995: 78, T. 31: 244; Blečić 2002: 99-100, T. 1: 11; Pare 2008: 87, Fig. 5.9 B5; Barbarić 2009: 316, Fig. 6: 3.

#### T. 4

### KRALJEVICA

**Discovery:** Designated as from Kraljevica, in the AMZ is preserved a pin which was allegedly discovered in the cave Šiljevica on Oštro. It was donated to the AMZ and lacks any detailed information's about its discovery.

- 179.** Fragment of a bronze pin with a byconical, grooved head flattened on the top. The upper part of the head is smaller than the lower one and the two parts are divided by a central groove which is decorated with oblique incisions. On every side are 4 shallow grooves. The pin is bent; it has around cross-section and is missing the point.

**Size:** length 2.9 cm; diameter of the head 1.1 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-Kraljevica

**Literature:** Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 8: 1.

ma. Na svakoj je polovici ukrašena sa 4 plitko urezane linije. Iгла je blago savijena, okruglog presjeka, bez zašiljenog kraja.

**Veličina:** duž. 2,9 cm; pr. glavice 1,1 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-Kraljevica

**Literatura:** Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 8: 1.

#### T. 4

### JABLANAC – Klačenica

**Nalaz:** Zbirka predmeta koji potječu iz nekropole gradine na Klačenici iznad Jablanca čuva se u AMZ-u. Istraživanja su vršena u tri pokušaja krajem 19. i početkom 20. stoljeća, prve dvije kampanje od muzejskih povjerenika i treća iskopavanjem J. Brunšmida 1900. godine. Grobovi su obilježeni prema istraživačima i numerički, jer u inventaru nisu drugačije navedeni. Ostala građa koja je prikupljena bez ikakvih podataka obrađena je kao pojedinačni nalaz iz Klačenice.

#### Grob 1-Vukelić 1895./1896.

**180.** Dvodijelna brončana zmijasta fibula, sedlasto oblikovanoga luka spuštenog između dvije ravnomjerno postavljene petlje. Luk je okruglog presjeka, ukrašen duboko urezanim linijama po gornjoj strani luka. Završava suženim, četvrtasto profiliranim i uvijenim krajem kojim je pričvršćen na iglu. Noga je četvrtastog presjeka, raskovana, s petljom koja završava diskom od 3 navoja, pravokutnog presjeka. Iгла je okruglog oblika glavice s čepastom istakom (trnom) na vrhu, okruglog presjeka vrata na kome se nalazi tanki i oštro profiliran disk. Slijedi četvrtasto perforirano zadebljanje u kojeg je pričvršćen luk fibule. Iгла je okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog završetka. Na igli se nalazila manja karičica trokutastog presjeka.

**Veličina:** duž. 8,8 cm; vis. 1,6 cm; deb. luka 0,2 cm; pr. diska 1,5 cm; pr. glavice igle 0,7 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15996<sup>859</sup>

#### Grob 2-Vurster 189?

**181.** Brončana lučna jedнопетljasta fibula kružnog presjeka luka, narebrenog ukrasa. Luk se prema kraju sužava i prelazi u oprugu od jednog navoja, koji se produžava u iglu zašiljenog završetka, okruglog presjeka. Noga je djelomično sačuvana nosačem za iglu komu nedostaje spiralni disk na kraju.

**Veličina:** duž. 6,3 cm; vis. 2,9 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15999

**182.** Brončana lučna jedнопетljasta fibula kružnog presjeka luka. Luk se prema kraju sužava i prelazi u oprugu od jednog navoja, koja se produžuje u iglu. Iгла je polomljena i okruglog presjeka. Noga je djelomično sačuvana nosačem za iglu, komu na kraju nedostaje spiralni disk. Luk je duž cijele površine ukrašen plitko urezanim, na dijelovima jako izlizanim, paralelnim snopovima od po 5 ukošenih linija.

**Veličina:** duž. 5,8 cm; vis. 3,4 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-16000

**183.** Ulomak velike igle od brončane žice okruglog presjeka s očuvanim presvlakama. Na iglu su dodana dva pločasta, blago konkavna diska, oštih rubova, koji nisu učvršćeni.

**Veličina:** duž. 17,2 cm; pr. diska 2,7 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-16002

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

#### T. 4

### JABLANAC – Klačenica

**Discovery:** A collection of finds coming from the necropolis on the hill-fort of Klačenica above Jablanac is kept in the AMZ. Excavations were conducted in three campaigns at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century – first two campaigns by museum commissioners and the third one by J. Brunšmid in 1906. The graves, not mentioned in a different way in the inventory, were listed according to the excavator and according to their number. Other finds collected, lacking any information's about its discovery, were treated as individual finds.

#### Grave 1-Vukelić 1895/1896

**180.** Two-part bronze serpentine fibula with a saddle-shaped bow lowered between two equally places coils. The bow has a round cross-section and is decorated with deeply incised lines on its upper side. It ends with a square and rolled up end which is fixed to the pin. The foot is square-shaped, thinned with a loop ending with a plate disc with 3 coils. The pin has a round head with a bung-shaped protuberance on the top, a neck with a round cross-section on which is located a thin disc, followed by a thickening with a square hole for the fixation of the bow. The pin has a round cross-section and a pointed end. On the pin was also a smaller ring with a triangular cross-section.

**Size:** length 8.8 cm; height 1.6 cm; thickness of the bow 0.2 cm; diameter of the disc 1.5 cm; diameter of the head 0.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15996<sup>859</sup>

#### Grave 2-Vurster 189?

**181.** Bronze bow fibula with a single loop. It has a round cross-section of the bow which has a ribbed ornament. The bow is thinned at the end and it changes in to the spring with a single coil ending in a pointed pin with a round cross-section. The foot is partly preserved – only the pin holder is preserved while the spiral disc at the end is missing.

**Size:** length 6.3 cm; height 2.9 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15999

**182.** Bronze bow fibula with a single loop. It has a round cross-section of the bow. The bow is thinned at the end and it changes in to the spring with a single coil ending in a broken pin with a round cross-section. The foot is partly preserved – only the pin holder is preserved while the spiral disc at the end is missing. The bow is completely decorated with partly eroded shallow incisions of parallel sheaves of 5 oblique lines.

**Size:** length 5.8 cm; height 3.4 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-16000

**183.** Fragment of a large pin made from bronze wire with a round cross-section with preserved casing. On the pin are added two flat, slightly concave discs with sharp edges which are not fixed.

**Size:** length 17.2 cm; diameter of the disc 2.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-16002

**Literature:** Unpublished.

**184.** Five flat connected bronze rings (according to Brunšmid 1901).

**185.** A smaller bronze plate and buttons (according to Brunšmid 1901).

<sup>859</sup> U inventarnim karticama stoji da je tu fibulu iskopao Brunšmid 1900. godine, što je netočan podatak.

<sup>859</sup> In the inventory it is listed that the fibula was excavated by Brunšmid in 1900, which is not true.

**184.** Pet brončanih plosnatih karika, međusobno spojenih (prema Brunšmid 1901).

**185.** Brončana manja pločica i dugmad (prema Brunšmid 1901).

### Grob 3-Brunšmid 1900.

**186.** Brončana lučna jednopetljasta fibula kružnog presjeka luka. Luk se prema kraju sužava i prelazi u oprugu od jednog navoja, koja je od igle polomljena. Igla je okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog kraja. Noga je djelomično sačuvana polukružnim nosačem za iglu. Luk je duž cijele površine ukrašen s plitko urezanih, na dijelovima izlizanih 9 snopova od po 10 paralelnih linija.

**Veličina:** duž. 8,6 cm; vis. 4,6 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15998

**187.** Brončana lučna jednopetljasta fibula, tordiranog kružnog presjeka luka. Luk je prema kraju sužen, četvrtasto raskovan i prelazi u oprugu od jednog navoja, koja je od igle polomljena. Igla je okruglog presjeka i zašiljenog završetka. Noga je djelomično sačuvana raskovanom pravokutnom pločicom.

**Veličina:** duž. 5,9 cm; vis. 3,4 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-15997

**Literatura:** Vurster 1900: 230; Brunšmid 1901: 53-59, T. I; Glogović 1989: 6, 18-21, T. 17: 1-2, T. 19: 2; Glogović 2003: 16, 17-18, 47, T. 10: 55, T. 10: 57, T. 10: 68-69, T. 47: 355.

## T. 5

### Pojedinačni nalazi

**Nalaz:** Građa prikupljena iz Klačenice bez ikakvih osnovnih podataka, osim da potječe iz kamenih grobova s inhumacijom ili je, jednostavno, bila poklonjena AMZ-u.

**188.** Velika brončana igla s diskastom pločicom na vrhu glavice, okruglog presjeka i tri kuglasta zadebljanja na vratu koja se ravnomjerno smanjuju prema igli. Igla je okruglog presjeka i napuknuta na 3 dijela. Potječe iz tzv. grobova koje je iskopao Lj. Vukelić tijekom 1895.-1896. godine, bez pobližih podataka. U inventaru se navodi kao iskop.<sup>860</sup>

**Veličina:** duž. 27 cm. (prema Brunšmid 1901).

**189.** Brončana igla s koničnom glavicom i tordiranim vratom, tipa Caprara. Glavica je strešastog oblika, blagog pada, sa dva zadebljanja na vratu, od kojih je drugi bikonično profiliran. Vrat je gusto tordiran i, kao i igla, okruglog presjeka.

**Nalaz:** Igla je nađena 1887. godine i poklonjena Š. Ljubiću od obitelji Stokić (Ljubić 1889a: 105).

**Veličina:** duž. 19,2 cm; pr. glavice 1,2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-16004

**190.** Veća brončana igla sa spiralnom uvijenom glavicom. Glavica je raskovana, pravokutnog presjeka. Igla je zašiljena, okruglog presjeka.

**Veličina:** duž. 16 cm; pr. glavice 0,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-16003

**191.** Ulomak brončanog tordiranog torkvesa, sa raskovanim i spiralno uvijenim krajem.

**Veličina:** duž. 4 cm; deb. žice 0,2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-16001

**192.** Brončani spiralni ukrasi-saltaleone, brončana dugmad (prema Brunšmid 1901).

**193.** Ulomak veće keramičke okrugle pekve, okruglog presjeka.

**Veličina:** duž. 8 cm; pr. 3,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-1864-1

### Grave 3-Brunšmid 1900

**186.** Bronze bow fibula with a single loop. It has a round cross-section of the bow. The bow is thinned at the end and it changes in to the spring with a single coil ending in a broken pin with a round cross-section. The foot is partly preserved – only the semicircular pin holder is preserved. The bow is completely decorated with partly eroded shallow incisions of 9 sheaves of 10 parallel lines.

**Size:** length 8.6 cm; height 4.6 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15998

**187.** Bronze bow fibula with a single loop and twisted bow. The bow is thinned, square hammered at the end and it changes in to the spring with a single coil ending in a broken pin with a round cross-section and a pointed end. The foot is partly preserved with a hammered square plate.

**Size:** length 5.9 cm; height 3.4 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-15997

**Literature:** Vurster 1900: 230; Brunšmid 1901: 53-59, T. I; Glogović 1989: 6, 18-21, T. 17: 1-2, T. 19: 2; Glogović 2003: 16, 17-18, 47, T. 10: 55, T. 10: 57, T. 10: 68-69, T. 47: 355.

## T. 5

### Individual finds

**Discovery:** Finds collected in Klačenica without any basic information beside the notion that they come from inhumation graves in stone chests or the information's that they were simply donated to the AMZ.

**188.** Large bronze pin with a disc-shaped plate on the top. It has a round cross-section and three circular thickenings on the neck. The pin with a round cross-section regularly narrows towards the point – it is cracked in to 3 parts. It comes from the graves excavated from 1895 to 1896 by Lj. Vukelić. It lacks any information but in the inventory it is mentioned as a trench.<sup>860</sup>

**Size:** length 27 cm (according to Brunšmid 1901).

**189.** Bronze pin with a conical head and a twisted neck of the Caprara type. The head has a roofed-shape with a slight incline, two thickenings on the neck from which the second one is byconically profiled. The neck is thickly twisted and, as the pin, has a round cross-section.

**Discovery:** The pin was discovered in 1887. And donated to Š. Ljubić by the family Stokić (Ljubić 1889a: 105).

**Size:** length 19.2 cm; diameter of the head 1.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-16004

**190.** Larger bronze pin with a spirally rolled up head. The head is hammered and has a square cross-section. The pin has a round cross-section and a pointed end.

**Size:** length 16 cm; diameter of the head 0.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-16003

**191.** Fragment of a bronze twisted torques with hammered, spirally rolled up ends.

**Size:** length 4 cm; thickness of the wire 0.2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-16001

**192.** Bronze spiral decorations – saltaleoni, bronze buttons (according to Brunšmid 1901).

**193.** Fragment of a larger round ceramic backing lids with a round cross-section.

**Size:** length 8 cm; diameter 3.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-1864-1

<sup>860</sup> Podatci preuzeti od: Brunšmid 1901: 55, T. I: 1 desno.

<sup>860</sup> Data from Brunšmid 1901: 55, T. I: 1 right.

- 194.** Ulomak masivne horizontalne ručke okruglog presjeka.  
**Veličina:** duž. 8 cm; pr. 2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-1864-2
- 195.** Ulomak tijela keramičke posude i široke trakaste, vertikalno postavljene ručke.  
**Veličina:** duž. 8 cm; šir. 5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-1864-3
- 196.** Ulomak izvijenog ruba keramičke posude.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,2 cm; šir. 4 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-1864-4
- 197.** Ulomak zadebljanog ruba keramičke posude.  
**Veličina:** duž. 3,7 cm; šir. 3,2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-1864-5
- 198.** Ulomak ruba i tijela keramičke posude tanjih stijenki.  
**Veličina:** duž. 3,8 cm; šir. 3,2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-1864-6
- 199.** Ulomak uvijenog ruba keramičke posude.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,5 cm; šir. 2,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-1864-7
- 200.** Ulomak izvijenog ruba keramičke posude.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4 cm; šir. 3,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-1864-8
- 201.** Ulomak uvučenog ruba keramičke loptaste posude.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,5 cm; šir. 3,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-1864-9
- 202.** Ulomak facetiranog ruba posude, zdjele?  
**Veličina:** duž. 5,8 cm; šir. 5,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-1864-10  
**Literatura:** Brunšmid 1901: 53-57, T. I: 1, 9, 8; Batović 1976: Sl. 6: 1-2; Drechsler-Bižić 1976: T. VIII: 6-7, 8-9; Batović 1980: T. V: 20; Batović 1981: Sl. 8: 17, Sl. 10: 17; Glogović 1988a: T. II: 5; Sl. 1: 1; Glogović 1989: 10, T. 5: 1, T. 6: 3, T. 35: 8; Blečić 2007: Fig. 4.

#### T. 6-7

### KRK Kostrilj

**Nalaz:** U AMZ-u pohranjena je građa koja potječe iz gradi-  
ne Kostrilj nasuprot Vrbnika. Prikupio ju je učitelj Ivan Žic i  
poklonio Muzeju 1903. godine. Keramički materijal dijelom  
je publiciran.<sup>861</sup>

- 203.** Brončana djelomično očuvana igla s gusto tordiranim vratom,  
vjerojatno dio velike igle s lukovičastom glavicom tipa Šula.  
**Veličina:** 16 cm; pr. vrata 0,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5621  
**Literatura:** Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 4: 1.
- 204.** Brončani profiliran ulomak, vjerojatno, drške s ovalnom rupi-  
com u sredini.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,1 cm; šir. 1,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5620-1
- 205.** Brončani manji ulomak trokutastog oblika i presjeka.  
**Veličina:** duž. 2 cm; šir. 1,2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5620-2
- 206.** Ulomak loptaste keramičke posude uvučenog vrata s aplici-  
ranim ukrasom dvije horizontalne trake na ramenu. Gornja  
je ukrašena urezanim kosim linijama, a donja dubokim utis-  
cima. Keramika je tamnosmeđe boje.  
**Veličina:** duž. 6 cm; šir. 6 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-1
- 207.** Ulomak keramičke posude kuglastog tijela i blago izvijenog  
ruba. Na ramenu se nalazi ukras dvije horizontalne kanelure  
ispod kojeg je ukras četiri manja utisnuta kružna udubljenja.

<sup>861</sup> Glogović 1989: T. 47: 3-10.

- 194.** Fragment of a massive horizontal handle with a round cross-  
section.  
**Size:** length 8 cm; diameter 2 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-1864-2
- 195.** Fragments of the body of the vessel and a wide band like  
broad vertically placed handle.  
**Size:** length 8 cm; width 5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-1864-3
- 196.** Fragments of everted edge of a ceramic vessel.  
**Size:** length 4.2 cm; width 4 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-1864-4
- 197.** Fragment of a thickened edge of a ceramic vessel.  
**Size:** length 3.7 cm; width 3.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-1864-5
- 198.** Fragment of the edge a body of a ceramic vessel with thin walls.  
**Size:** length 3.8 cm; width 3.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-1864-6
- 199.** Fragment of an inverted edge of a ceramic vessel.  
**Size:** length 4.5 cm; width 2.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-1864-7
- 200.** Fragments of an everted edge of a ceramic vessel.  
**Size:** length 4 cm; width 3.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-1864-8
- 201.** Fragment of an inverted edge of a globular ceramic vessel.  
**Size:** length 4.5 cm; width 3.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-1864-9
- 202.** Fragment of a faceted edge of a vessel (a bowl?).  
**Size:** length 5.8 cm; width 5.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-1864-10  
**Literature:** Brunšmid 1901: 53-57, T. I: 1, 9, 8; Batović 1976: Sl. 6: 1-2; Drechsler-Bižić 1976: T. VIII: 6-7, 8-9; Batović 1980: T. V: 20; Batović 1981: Sl. 8: 17, Sl. 10: 17; Glogović 1988a: T. II: 5; Sl. 1: 1; Glogović 1989: 10, T. 5: 1, T. 6: 3, T. 35: 8; Blečić 2007: Fig. 4.

#### T. 6-7

### KRK Kostrilj

**Discovery:** In AMZ are preserved finds coming from the hill-  
fort of Kostrilj on the opposite side of Vrbnik. They were col-  
lected by the teacher Ivan Žic and donated to the Museum in  
1903. The pottery finds were partly published.<sup>861</sup>

- 203.** Partly preserved bronze pin with a densely twisted neck.  
Probably a part of a larger pin with an onion-shaped head of  
the Šula type.  
**Size:** length 16 cm; diameter of the neck 0.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ  
P-5621  
**Literature:** Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 4: 1.
- 204.** Bronze profiled fragment – most probably of a handle with an  
oval hole in the middle.  
**Size:** length 4.1 cm; width 1.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5620-1
- 205.** Smaller bronze fragment of triangular shape and cross-section.  
**Size:** length 2 cm; width 1.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5620-2
- 206.** Fragment of a globular shaped pot with inverted rim and  
two applied horizontal ribs on the shoulder. The upper one  
is decorated with incised oblique lines while the lower one  
is decorated with deep impressions. The pottery has a dark  
brown color.  
**Size:** length 6 cm; width 6 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-1
- 207.** Fragment of an oval pot with everted rim. On the shoulder are  
located two horizontal grooves below which are impressed  
four smaller circular impressions.

<sup>861</sup> Glogović 1989: T. 47: 3-10.

- Veličina:** duž. 4,7 cm; šir. 4 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-2
- 208.** Ulomak blago izvijenog ruba keramičke posude ukrašen utiskivanjem.  
**Veličina:** duž. 5,2 cm; šir. 3,2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-3
- 209.** Ulomak keramičke posude, zdjele, blago zadebljanog ruba, facetiranog s unutrašnje strane.  
**Veličina:** duž. 4,3 cm; šir. 3,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-4
- 210.** Veći ulomak keramičke zdjele razgrnutog ruba, facetiranog s unutrašnje strane i s očuvanim donjim dijelom koso, prema dolje, postavljene ručke.  
**Veličina:** duž. 9,7 cm; šir. 6,8 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-5
- 211.** Ulomak keramičke zdjele zaobljenog ramena, blago izvijenog ruba, facetiranog s unutrašnje strane.  
**Veličina:** duž. 10 cm; šir. 6,4 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-6
- 212.** Ulomak tijela keramičke posude ukrašen s bradavičastim ispupčenjem uokolo kojeg se nalazi dvostruka šira kanelura.  
**Veličina:** duž. 11 cm; šir. 6,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5615-1
- 213.** Ulomak tijela keramičke posude ukrašen s bradavičastim ispupčenjem uokolo kojeg se nalazi četverostruka šira kanelura.  
**Veličina:** duž. 10,3 cm; šir. 7 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5615-2
- 214.** Ulomak tijela keramičke posude ukrašen ornamentom pet utisnutih kružnih udubljenja.  
**Veličina:** duž. 7,5 cm; šir. 7,2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-7
- 215.** Ulomak keramičke veće bikonične posude s ukrasom kaneliranog ornamenta na ramenu i truhu. Ukrašen je izveden od horizontalne kanelure ispod koje su po dvije girlande od tri kanelure koje se spajaju i sijeku.  
**Veličina:** duž. 11 cm; šir. 9 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-8
- 216.** Ulomak tijela zaobljene keramičke posude s ukrasom dvostruke kanelure.  
**Veličina:** duž. 8 cm; šir. 5,7 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-9
- 217.** Ulomak izvijenog vrata veće keramičke posude ukrašene trostrukom horizontalnom kanelurom ispod koje se ukoše-no spuštaju dvije dvostruke kanelure.  
**Veličina:** duž. 12 cm; šir. 11,2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-10
- 218.** Ulomak veće keramičke posude, zdjele, ukrašene s unutar-nje strane ornamentom trostruke horizontalne kanelure.  
**Veličina:** duž. 11 cm; šir. 9,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5614-11
- 219.** Ulomak dna veće keramičke posude na nozi. S unutrašnje strane, na dnu se nalazi veće okruglo ispupčenje okruženo sa dvije kanelure, a sa strana su postavljena dva, odnosno vjerojatno su bila tri, ravnomjerno raspoređena okrugla ispupčenja.  
**Veličina:** vis. 5 cm; šir. 13,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5616  
**Literatura:** Glogović 1989: T. 47: 3-10.

## T. 8

### Šula

**Nalaz:** Kao kod kataloga Šula-Dobrinj. Dvije fibule i dvije narukvice AMZ-u je poklonio dr. Gržetić u 19. stoljeću koje je našao na mjestu Sv. Ivan, za devastacije tumula prilikom eksploatacije pijeska u pješčari Šuli kod Polja.<sup>862</sup>

<sup>862</sup> Ljubić 1876.

**Size:** length 4.7 cm; width 4 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-2

- 208.** Fragment of a slightly everted rim of a pot decorated with impressions.

**Size:** length 5.2 cm; width 3.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-3

- 209.** Fragment of a ceramic bowl with a slightly thickened rim faceted on the inner side.

**Size:** length 4.3 cm; width 3.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-4

- 210.** Larger fragment of a bowl with faceted inner side and a vertical handle applied on the outer side of the body.

**Size:** length 9.7 cm; width 6.8 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-5

- 211.** Fragment of a bowl with rounded shoulder, slightly everted rim and facets on the inner side.

**Size:** length 10 cm; width 6.4 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-6

- 212.** Fragment of the body of a ceramic vessel decorated with a wart like protuberance surrounded by a double groove.

**Size:** length 11 cm; width 6.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5615-1

- 213.** Fragment of the body of a ceramic vessel decorated with a wart like protuberance surrounded by a four grooves.

**Size:** length 10.3 cm; width 7 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5615-2

- 214.** Fragment of the body of a ceramic vessel decorated with five impressed hollows.

**Size:** length 7.5 cm; width 7.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-7

- 215.** Fragment of a larger byconically shaped ceramic vessel with grooved ornaments on the belly and shoulder. The decoration consists of a horizontal groove, below which are two garlands, touching and overlapping, consisting of three grooves.

**Size:** length 11 cm; width 9 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-8

- 216.** Fragments of the body of a globular ceramic vessel decorated with a double groove.

**Size:** length 8 cm; width 5.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-9

- 217.** Fragments of an everted neck of a ceramic vessel decorated with a triple horizontal groove below which are obliquely descending two double grooves.

**Size:** length 12 cm; width 11.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-10

- 218.** Fragment of a larger ceramic vessel, a bowl decorated on the inner side with a triple groove.

**Size:** length 11 cm; width 9.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5614-11

- 219.** Fragment of a bottom of a vessel on a foot. On the inner side was a circular protuberance surrounded with a double groove. On the sides are located two, most probably were three, regularly arranged circular protuberances.

**Size:** height 5 cm; width 13.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5616

**Literature:** Glogović 1989: T. 47: 3-10.

## T. 8

### Šula

**Discovery:** The same as in the catalogue entry for Šula-Dobrinj. Two fibulae and two bracelets were donated to the AMZ in the 19th century by dr. Gržetić. They were discovered on the locality of Sv. Ivan during the destruction of tumuli for digging sand in the sandpit of Šula near Polje.<sup>862</sup>

- 220.** A smaller fibula with two knobs on the bow, extremely eroded, repaired and patinated. The bow has a round cross-section

<sup>862</sup> Ljubić 1876.

**220.** Manja fibula sa dva dugmeta na luk, izrazito izlizana, popravljena i patinirana. Luk je okruglog presjeka, ukrašen urezanim geometrijskim motivima. Snopovi paralelnih linija formiraju metopna polja, koja su ispunjena različitim ornamentom. Prva je metopa, sa svake strane iznad dugmeta prazna, druga je ispunjena urezanim nasuprotno postavljenim girlandama, a u trećoj su urezani rombovi od kojih je svaki drugi ispunjen gusto urezanim linijama. Središnje je metopno polje na najvišem dijelu luka ispunjeno urezanim motivom borove grančice. Ispod dugmeta, prema završetku luka, vidljivo je tek nekoliko urezanih paralelnih linija, bez ispuna metopnih površina. Luk završava raskovanom oprugom od jednog navoja, rombičnog presjeka i s dodatnim ojačanjem na prijelazu navoja u iglu, čime je izvorno saniran prijelom. Igla je tanka i okruglog presjeka. Nožica je polukružna, mala i bez ukrasa. Luk je na tome dijelu, ispod dugmeta, ukrašen sa dva reda urezanih snopova linija, bez ukrasa metopnih polja. Ukras je djelomično oštećen i izlizan.

**Veličina:** duž. 12,3 cm; vis. 8,8 cm; pr. luka 0,6 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5623

**221.** Masivna brončana narukvica manšetastog tipa, ovalnog oblika, ravnih i razdvojenih krajeva, neravnomjerno uvučenih. Rubnici su sa svih strana blago izvučeni i zaobljeni. Središnjim dijelom narukvice teče 5 širih usporednih rebara, kojima se djelomično sačuvao ukas od koso urezanih crtica cijelom širinom rebra.

**Veličina:** šir. 3,8 cm; pr. 6,1 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5624-1

**222.** Masivna brončana narukvica manšetastog tipa, ovalnog oblika, ravnih i razdvojenih krajeva, jednakomjerno uvučenih. Rubnici su sa svih strana blago izvučeni i zaobljeni. Središnjim dijelom narukvice teče 5 širih usporednih rebara, kojima se djelomično sačuvao ukas od koso urezanih crtica cijelom širinom rebra. Narukvica je nešto veća i deblja od prethodne.

**Veličina:** šir. 4,1 cm; pr. 6,7 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5624-2

**Literatura:** Ljubić 1876: 32, T. III: 36, 36 kat. H-a4; Ljubić 1889: 32, 36; Batović 1983: T. XLV: 5-7; Glogović 1987: 73-91, T. I; Glogović 1989: T. 5: 3-4, T. 13, T. 35: 1-3; Glogović 2003: 9, T. 2: 10; Batović 2003: Sl. 3: 1, Sl. 5, Sl. 6: 4; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 4.

**223.** Ulomak većeg jelenjeg roga s ostatkom krune, bazalnog dijela i početka prvog paroška.

**Veličina:** duž. 23 cm; šir. 6,5 cm; pr. 3,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-20538

**224.** Ulomak blago izvijenog ruba keramičke posude, zdjele.

**Veličina:** duž. 7,5 cm; šir. 5,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5633-2

**225.** Ulomak ruba keramičke posude.

**Veličina:** duž. 5,5 cm; šir. 4 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5633-3

**226.** Ulomak zaobljenog tijela keramičke loptaste(?) posude. Ukrašen sa tri plitke kanelure.

**Veličina:** duž. 7,8 cm; šir. 4,6 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5633-4

**227.** Ulomak tijela keramičke posude, ukrašen nepravilnim metličastim ornamentom.

**Veličina:** duž. 6,3 cm; šir. 5,2 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5633-5

**228.** Ulomak tijela keramičke posude.

**Veličina:** duž. 4,7 cm; šir. 3,5 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-5633-6

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

and is decorated with geometric motives. Sheaves of parallel lines form metope fields which are filled with different ornaments. First metope on every side above the knob is empty the second one is filled with incised opposing garlands while in the third one are incised rhombs. Every single one of them is filled with densely incised lines. The central metope field on the highest part of the bow is filled with incised motives of a pine twig. Below the knob towards the end of the bow are visible only several incised lines lacking the filling of the metope fields. The bow ends with a single coil with a rhomboidal cross-section with an additional strengthening of the transition from the spring in to the pin repairing the initial break. The pin is thin and had a round cross-section. The foot is of semicircular form, small and undecorated. The bow is towards the foot below the knob decorated with two rows of incised sheaves of lines lacking the decoration of the metope fields. The decoration was partly damaged and worn during the restoration.

**Size:** length 12.3 cm; height 8.8 cm; diameter of the bow 0.6 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5623

**221.** Massive bronze cuff-shaped bracelet with straight and separated unevenly indented ends. The flanges are slightly turned up and rounded. On the central part of the bracelet are running five broader parallel ribs, on which is partly preserved the decoration of obliquely incised lines, covering the whole width of the ribs.

**Size:** width 3.8 cm; diameter 6.1 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5624-1

**222.** Massive bronze cuff-shaped bracelet with straight and separated unevenly indented ends. The flanges are slightly turned up and rounded. On the central part of the bracelet are running five broader parallel ribs on which is partly preserved the decoration of obliquely incised lines covering the whole width of the ribs. The bracelet is slightly bigger and thicker than the preceding one.

**Size:** width 4.1 cm; diameter 6.7 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5624-2

**Literature:** Ljubić 1876: 32, T. III: 36, 36 cat. H-a4; Ljubić 1889: 32, 36; Batović 1983: T. XLV: 5-7; Glogović 1987: 73-91, T. I; Glogović 1989: T. 5: 3-4, T. 13, T. 35: 1-3; Glogović 2003: 9, T. 2: 10; Batović 2003: Sl. 3: 1, Sl. 5, Sl. 6: 4; Blečić Kavur 2011: Fig. 4.

**223.** A larger fragment of a deer's horn with the remains of the burr, basal part and the beginning of the brow tine.

**Size:** length 23 cm; width 6.5 cm; diameter 3.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-20538

**224.** A fragment of a slightly everted rim of a ceramic bowl.

**Size:** length 7.5 cm; width 5.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5633-2

**225.** Fragment of the rim of a vessel.

**Size:** length 5.5 cm; width 4 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5633-3

**226.** Fragment of a rounded body of a ceramic vessel of spherical shape. It is decorated with three shallow grooves.

**Size:** length 7.8 cm; width 4.6 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5633-4

**227.** Fragment of the body of a ceramic vessel with irregular combed decoration.

**Size:** length 6.3 cm; width 5.2 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5633-5

**228.** Fragment of the body of a ceramic vessel.

**Size:** length 4.7 cm; width 3.5 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-5633-6

**Literature:** unpublished.

T. 9

## SV. JURAJ = Jurjevo

**Nalaz:** Skroman broj predmeta iz Sv. Jurja nalazi se i u AMZ-u koja je kao sporadični nalaz iz nekropole i/ili poklon prikupljena još u 19. stoljeću. Š. Ljubić objavljuje dio te građe u svom prvom popisu 1876. godine, gdje naravno navodi i predmete kojih u toj Zbirci više nema, npr. saltaleoni i sl.<sup>863</sup>

229. Brončani karičasti lančić od po dvije spojene karičice, plosnatog pravokutnog presjeka.

**Veličina:** duž. 19,1 cm; pr. karičice 0,8 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-20528

**Literatura:** neobjavljeno

230. Brončani nož tipa Jurjevo, većih dimenzija, zakrivljene oštrice i sačuvane drške. Drška je brončana, ovalnog presjeka i sa 4 zakovice pričvršćena na trn. Sječivo je zakrivljeno, prema dršku suženo, u središnjem dijelu lučno prošireno, u oštrici ravno i zašiljeno, trokutastog presjeka. Ukrašeno je urezanim linijama, koje pri hrptu noža čine neprekinuti cik-cak ornament od 12 snopova kosih linija, između dvije do tri paralelno urezane linije. Ukrašen je deblja šrafirana traka, koja prati liniju sječiva, a iznad nje su izvedeni šrafirani niski trokuti s urezanom linijom na vrhu, koji se povećavaju od trna prema oštrici. Oštrica je ravna i zašiljena. Hrbat je noža ornamentiran neprekinutim cik-cak motivom od 3 urezane linije.

**Veličina:** duž. 29,4 cm; deb. rukohvata 1,8 cm; šir. sječiva 3,6 cm. Inv. br.: AMZ P-20002

**Literatura:** Ljubić 1889: T. X: 37; Batović 1980: 36, T. VIII: 2; Batović 1983: 313, Sl. 20; Glogović 1989: 16, T. 12: 1; Glogović 1993: 239-243, Fig. 1:1; Bakarić 1993: 100, kat. 49; Bakarić 2004a: 92, Sl. 123; Bakarić 2008: 194, kat. 139.

T. 9

## SV. JURAJ = Jurjevo

**Discovery:** A smaller number of finds from Sv. Juraj kept in the AMZ were collected as sporadic finds from the necropolis and/or donations already in the 19th century. Š. Ljubić published a part of these finds in his first catalogue in 1876 where he lists also finds which are now lost – such as saltaleoni and others.<sup>863</sup>

229. Bronze chain made from double joint rings of flat rectangular cross-section.

**Size:** length 19.1 cm; diameter of the rings 0.8 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-20528

**Literature:** unpublished

230. A larger bronze knife of Jurjevo type with a bent blade and preserved handle. The handle is made from bronze; it has an oval cross-section and is fixed to the tang with 4 rivets. The blade with a triangular cross-section is curved, narrower towards the handle and widened in the central part. The point is straight and pointed. It is decorated with incised lines which along the back of the blade form an uninterrupted zigzag ornament of 12 sheaves of oblique lines between 2 to 3 parallel incised lines. The decoration ends before the point of the blade. Below, running along the middle of the blade is a thicker hatched line following the line of the blade. Above it are located hatched low triangles with an incised line on the top which becomes longer from the handle toward the tip. The blade is straight and pointed. The back of the knife is decorated with uninterrupted zigzag motive of 3 incised lines.

**Size:** length 29.4 cm; thickness of the handle 1.8 cm; width of the blade 3.6 cm. Inv. nr.: AMZ P-20002

**Literature:** Ljubić 1889: T. X: 37; Batović 1980: 36, T. VIII: 2; Batović 1983: 313, Sl. 20; Glogović 1989: 16, T. 12: 1; Glogović 1993: 239-243, Fig. 1:1; Bakarić 1993: 100, cat. 49; Bakarić 2004a: 92, Sl. 123; Bakarić 2008: 194, cat. 139.

<sup>863</sup> Ljubić 1876: 24, 40 kat. H-f1-2, 46.

<sup>863</sup> Ljubić 1876: 24, 40 cat. H-f1-2, 46.





## Liste nalazišta / Lists of finds

### Lista / List 1.

**Slika 22.** Karta rasprostranjenosti fibula sa dva dugmeta na luku liburnske (●), japodske (■) i kvarnerske (▲) varijante te italskih importa s dvostruko profiliranim dugmetom (★) (nadopunjeno prema Drechsler-Bižić 1976; Glogović 2003)

**Figure 22.** Distribution map of the bow fibula with two knobs on the bow: liburnian (●), japodian (■) and kvarnerian (▲) variants, and with the italic import with double profiled knobs (★) (supplemented after Drechsler-Bižić 1976; Glogović 2003)

1. Šmihel (J. Horvat 2002: Fig. 28)
2. Škocjan - Mušja jama, Brežec
3. **Grižane**
4. **Stolnič**
5. **Krk-Šula**
6. **Cres-Osor**
7. Hrvatsko polje
8. Kompolje
9. Prozor
10. **Pag – Novalja, Vidasi**
11. Nin (neobjavljeno/unpublished, MNS, Nin)
12. Vrsi (sl. 26)
13. Ljubač
14. Zaton
15. Dugi otok - Sali, Dugo polje
16. Sukošan, Raštane Donje
17. Bjelina
18. Krković
19. Ždrapanj
20. Tiškovac
21. Knin, Cviljane
22. Vis
23. Debeli Vrh nad Predgradom? (Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 167, T. 66: 73)

### Lista / List 2.

**Slika 25.** Rasprostranjenost jantarnih perli tipa Tiryns (●) i tipa Allumiere (▲) (nadopunjeno prema Cultraro 2006; Negroni Cattachio et al. 2006; Blečić Kavur 2012a)

**Figure 25.** Distribution map of amber beads of Tiryns (●) and Allumiere (▲) types (supplemented after Cultraro 2006; Negroni Cattachio et al.

2006; Blečić Kavur 2012a)

1. Hauterive-Champréveyeres
2. Montlingerberg
3. Isolino Virginia
4. Doss Castel di Fai della Paganella (Marzatico 2002: 193, Fig. 1: 21)
5. Clanezzo, Grotta Costa Cavallina
6. Calcinato, Ponte San Marco
7. Peschiera (De Marinis 2007: 65, Fig. 5b)
8. Fondo Paviani
9. Fratessina (sl. 28)
10. Campestrin di Grignano Pole-sine (Bellintani et al. 2012)
11. Bismantova (sl. 27)
12. Bologna, Borgo Panigale
13. Forli, Monte Battaglia (Miari 2007: 80-81)
14. Candalla Riparo dell'Ambr
15. Lucca, Cammaiore
16. Populonia
17. Paniculara
18. Viterbo, Ponte S. Pietro Valle; Ischia di Castro
19. Poggio La Pozza, Allumiere
20. Osteria dell'Osa
21. Campo del Fico, Ardea
22. Capitanata
23. Coppa Navigata
24. Taranto, Torre Castellucia
25. Lipari, Piazza Monfalcone
26. Serra Niedda di Sorso
27. Attentu, Nuraghe
28. Alghero, Palmavera
29. Siligo, Monte Sant' Antonio
30. Bitti, Romanzesu
31. Orani, Nurdòle
32. Oliena, Sa Sedda'e Sos Carros
33. Fonni, Germanu
34. Oristano, Motrox'e Bois (Usai 2007: 100-101)
35. Villagrande Strisaili, Sa Carcaredda
36. S. Anastasia di Sardara (Bellintani et al. 2012)
37. Nuragus, Forraxi Nioi
38. Serri, Santa Vittoria
39. Cagliari-Antas, Flumini-maggiore (Usai 2007: 102)
40. Debeli Vrh nad Predgradom
41. **Krk-?**
42. **Krk-Baška**
43. Kosinj, Pečina Golubnjača
44. **Pag-Novalja, Vidasi**
45. Privlaka
46. Vrsi (sl. 26)
47. Mati?
48. Barç

49. Prodan
50. Thásos-Kastro
51. Ayios Georghios/Golemi
52. Elateia
53. Zeli
54. Medeon
55. Thisbe/Thísvi
56. Salamis
57. Tiryns-ostava
58. Tiryns, grobnica Ayos Elias
59. Ayia Moni, Nauplion
60. Ayios Ioannis, Leontio
61. Pátra-Clauss
62. Pátra-Kallithéa
63. Teichos Dymaion
64. Elide/Élis
65. Trypes, Kladeos (Dörrer 2008: 559, Abb. 10).
66. Pýlos
67. Kefalonia-Diakata
68. Kefalonia-Lakithra
69. Kefalonia-Metaxata
70. Kríti-Dikteon Andron
71. Ródos-Ialysós
72. Ugarit/Ras Shamra
73. Akhziv
74. Dridu
75. Hordeevka

### Lista / List 3.

**Slika 31.** Karta prostorne distribucije torquesa s obručastim privjescima i obručastih privjesaka na prostoru Alpa i jadranskog bazena starije (●) i mlađe (▲) varijante (nadopunjeno prema Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001, Primas 2011)

**Figure 31.** Distribution map of torqueses with ring-shaped pendants and ring-shaped pendants on the territory of the Alps and the Adriatic basin; older (●) and younger (▲) variant (supplemented after Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001; Primas 2011)

1. Loubière
2. Réallon
3. Hauterive-Champréveyeres
4. Grünwald (Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 183: 8)
5. Kelheim
6. Überackern (Erbach 1995: Abb. 3: 5)
7. Hallstatt
8. Celldömölk-Saghegy (Mozsolics 2000: T. 19: 10; T. 122: 1; T. 125: 11-14; T. 126: 12)
9. Ormož (Tomanič-Jevremov 1989: T. 17: 5)

10. Zavrč (neobjavljeno/unpublished CPA OE Ptuj)
11. Dobova (sl. 32)
12. Kanalski Vrh
13. Limska Gradina (Mihovilić 1972: T. 5: 8-11; T. 8: 15-18; T. 26: 6-7, 25; T. 29: 10; T. 30: 8) (sl. 30)
14. **Krk-Baška**
15. **Cres-Osor**
16. Nin (Batović 1981: sl. 4: 20; Hiller 1991: T. 4: 46-47; T. 5)
17. Zaton (Batović 1981: sl. 12)
18. Bologna, San Vitale

### Lista / List 4.

**Slika 34.** Karta rasprostranjenosti trapezastih-antropomorfnih privjesaka kao na slici 33: tip I (●), tip II (■), tip III (▲), tip IV (◆)

**Figure 34.** Distribution map of the trapezoid-anthropomorphic pendants as it is shown on fig. 33: type I (●), type II (■), type III (▲), type IV (◆)

1. Maribor (Müller-Karpe 1959: T. 118: 25)
2. Pobrežje (Pahič 1972: T. 27)
3. Ruše (Kaerner 1989: Abb. 7: 3, 5)
4. Dobova (Starè 1951: 65, Ris. 6, sl. 1; Starè 1975: T. 1: 1, T. 3: 3, T. 8: 17/9)(sl. 32)
5. Picugi (Mladin 1980: 176, 190, sl. 2: 9; Mihovilić 1987: T. I: 1; Majnarić-Pandžić 1998: sl. 45; Mihovilić 2013: sl. 82)
6. **Krk-?**
7. Veliki Mošunj (Čović 1984: 15; Harding 1995: T. 65: 1, 5, 10; König 2004b: 127-137)

### Lista / List 5.

**Slika 35.** Karta rasprostranjenosti mačeva tipa Allerona/Naue IIC (■) i mačeva neodređenog tipa Naue II (★) (nadopunjeno prema Bianco Peroni 1970; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993; Harding 1995; Eder, Jung 2005)

**Figure 35.** Distribution map of the swords of the Allerona/Naue II type (■) and Naue II, type unknown (★) (supplemented after Bianco Peroni 1970; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993; Harding 1995; Eder, Jung 2005)

1. Trento, Rovereto
2. Campodenno
3. Casale sul Sile
4. Gazzo Veronese (Salzani 2002a: Fig. 1:1)
5. Olmo di Nogara
6. Narde
7. Montegiorgio
8. Poggio Berni
9. Lago Trasimeno
10. Ascoli Piceno, Montegiorgio
11. Alleron
12. Fucino
13. San Benedetto in Perillis
14. Vibo Valentia
15. Castellace
16. Škocjan-Mušja jama
17. **Krk-Sužan**
18. Biograd na moru, Vrana
19. Sisak
20. Veliko Nabrđe
21. Slavonski Brod
22. Ruma, Donji Petrovci
23. Smederevo
24. Pavelsko
25. Prilep
26. Bitola, Krklino
27. Roshtan kod Prrenjasit-Librazhd
28. Barç, Korçë (sl. 36)
29. Vajza, Vlōre
30. Dukat, Vlōre
31. Agalianon, Limen Trihonis
32. Orhomenos
33. Steni, Levádeia
34. Lousiká
35. Krini
36. Pátra-Clauss
37. Pórtēs
38. Pátra-Kallithéa
39. Palaiokáastro
40. Tyrins
41. Nákxos-Grotta
42. Nákxos-Kamini
43. Kríti-Knossos
44. Kríti-Mesara, Kainourgio
45. Kríti-Lasithi, Sítia
46. Kríti-Mouliana
47. Kýpros-Enkomi

#### Lista / List 6.

**Slika 38.** Karta rasprostranjenosti igala s većom bikoničnom, na vrhu spljoštenom i kaneliranom glavicom (nadopunjeno prema Dular 2002; Vasić 2003; König 2004a)

**Figure 38.** Distribution map of the pins with a byconical, on top flattened and horizontally grooved head (supplemented after Dular 2002; Vasić 2003; König 2004a)

1. Pölöske
2. Keszthely
3. Nagyveike
4. Novi Bečej (Bordjoš/Borjas)
5. Vršac-Kozluk
6. Markovac-Grujac
7. Banatska Palanka
8. Bradarac
9. Drmno-Korabe
10. Brestovik
11. Zemun
12. Šimanovci
13. Popinci
14. Donji Petrovci II
15. Ugrinovci
16. Krčedin

17. Futog
18. Bingula Divoš
19. Gomolava
20. Salaš Noćajski
21. Rudnik
22. Stapari
23. Srbija?
24. Bošnjaci
25. Županja
26. Otok Privlaka
27. Barice
28. Kučišta
29. Brusnica Mala
30. Poljanci I
31. Poljanci II i IV (Miklik-Lozuc 2009: 108, k. 255)
32. Veliko Nabrđe
33. Gornja Vrba
34. Slavonski Brod
35. Brodski Varoš
36. Stupnik
37. Pričac
38. Laminaci, Dejanovića humke (Ludajić 2011: T. IX: 6)
39. Gornji Slatnik
40. Našice, Malinovac (Vrkić, Maurin 2012: sl. 6, T. 1: 2)
41. Vojvodine, Migalovci (Nodilo et al. 2012: T. 5: 2).
42. Virovitica
43. Sisak
44. Križevci
45. Kalnik
46. Oloris, Dolnji Lakoš
47. Ptuj, Rabelčja vas (Strmčnik-Gulić 1988: 159, T. 4. 25)
48. Gorenji Suhadol (Stipančić 2009: 229, k. 10b)
49. Malička
50. Siča/Lučica (Perkić, Ložnjak Dizdar 2005: 69-70, T. 6: 108).
51. **Kraljevica, Oštro-pećina Šiljevica**
52. Velika Mrdakovica (Mendušić, Pedišić, Krnčević 1993: 10, kat. 25; Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014: T. 1: 1)
53. Danilo Birnje, Crno brdo (Mendušić, Pedišić, Krnčević 1993: 10, kat. 24, sl. 4; Krnčević, Mendušić, Pedišić 2000: 27)

#### Lista / List 7

**Slika 39.** Karta rasprostranjenosti igala tipa Šula (●), varijante s četvrtasto profiliranim zadebljanjem vrata (■) i varijante sa spiralno ukrašenom glavicom (▲): crveni krug vjerojatno igle tipa Šula? (nadopunjeno prema Blečić Kavur 2011)

**Figure 39.** Distribution map of the pins of the Šula type (●), variants with a twisted neck of a square cross-section (■) and variant with spiral decorated head (▲): red circle probably pins of the Šula type? (supplemented after Blečić Kavur 2011)

1. Bled, Pristava
2. Ljubljana
3. Dobova
4. Škocjan-Mušja jama, Brežec
5. **Grižane?** (izgubljena/lost)
6. **Stolnič**
7. **Krk-Šula**
8. **Krk-Vrbnik**

9. **Krk-Garica**
10. Nezakcij
11. **Pag-Novalja, Vidasi**
12. Krneza, Jokina Glavica (Marijanović 2012: T. I: 2; T. VI: 3)

#### Lista / List 8.

**Slika 44.** Karta rasprostranjenosti igala tipa Marco (▲) (nadopunjeno prema Blečić Kavur 2011)

**Figure 44.** Distribution map of pins of Marco type (▲) (supplemented after Blečić Kavur 2011)

**Slika 45.** Karta rasprostranjenosti igala tipa Velika Gorica (■) i varijante (★) (prema Blečić Kavur 2011)

**Figure 45.** Distribution map of pins of Velika Gorica type (■) and variant (★) (after Blečić Kavur 2011)

1. Morano sul Po-Pobieto
2. Fontanella Mantovana
3. Fontanella, Grazioli
4. Gazzo Veronese, Colombara
5. Marco
6. Pergine
7. Campi Neri di Cles
8. Vadena
9. Angarano
10. Gradisca sul Cosa
11. Tolmin
12. Hallstatt
13. Wildon, Kainach
14. Ruše
15. Brinjeva Gora
16. Dobova
17. Velika Gorica
18. **Krk-Garica**
19. Škocjan - Mušja jama, Brežec
20. Elleri, S. Barbara
21. Nezakcij
22. Krneza, Jokina Glavica (Marijanović 2012: T. V: 3)

#### Lista / List 9.

**Slika 46.** Karta rasprostranjenosti manšetastih narebrenih narukvica varijante I (ravnih ●) i varijante II (uvijenih ■) krajeva, na području jugoistočnog alpskog prostora, sjevernog Jadrana i Dalmacije

**Figure 46.** Distribution map of the ribbed cuff-shaped bracelet; variant I (with straight ends ●) and variant II (with rolled up ends ■), on the territory of south-eastern Alpine region, north Adriatic and Dalmatia

1. Hočko pohorje (Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 187, T. 80: 111)
2. Dobova (Starè 1975: T. 26: 9)
3. Čremožiše (Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 145, T. 48: 67)
4. Jurka Vas (Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 201, T. 91: 34)
5. Škocjan-Brežec (Vitri, Steffé De Piero 1977: 120, T. XXX: XV, 3; T. XXXIII: T. 150: H)
6. Limska Gradina (Mihovilić 1972: 13-14, 22, T. 8: 5-7; T. 16: 13; Mihovilić 2013: 134, sl. 75)
7. Sv. Martin (Mihovilić et al. 2002: 32: 1)

8. Pula (Percan 2008: T. 32: 282-283)
9. Nezakcij (Mihovilić 2001: 218, T. 63: 1-9; Mihovilić 2013: 134, sl. 75)

10. **Cres-Osor**
11. **Krk-Garica**
12. **Krk-Šula**
13. **Stolnič**
14. **Pag-Novalja, Vidasi**
15. Vrsi (sl. 26)

16. Privlaka (Batović 1987: T. XLIV: 15)
17. Murter-Mali Vinik (Marović 1962: sl. 2: 1; Batović 1987: 311)
18. Drniš, Balina glavica (Marović 1962: sl. 4: 2; Batović 1987: 339, sl. 21: 11)
19. Solin, Vranjic/Trcela (Batović 1987: T. XLVIII: 17-18)
20. Sipont (sl. 47)
21. Salapia (sl. 48)
22. Krneza, Duševića Glavica? (Gusar, Vujević 2012: T. V: 2-4)
23. Debeli vrh nad Predgradom? (Čerče, Šinkovec 1995: 168, T. 66: 86) ?

#### Lista / List 10.

**Slika 49.** Karta rasprostranjenosti narukvica dvoslinnog presjeka na području sjevernog Jadrana i Dalmacije (nadopunjeno prema Batović 1960; Glogović 1989)

**Figure 49.** Distribution map of bracelet with a double-pitch cross-section on the territory of north Adriatic and Dalmatia (supplemented after Batović 1960; Glogović 1989)

1. Škocjan-Brežec (sl. 61)
2. Picugi
3. Limska Gradina (sl. 30)
4. Pula (Percan 2008: T. 43: 463)
5. Nezakcij (sl. 43)
6. **Rijeka**
7. **Grižane**
8. **Krk-?**
9. **Krk-Baška**
10. **Cres-Merag**
11. **Cres-Osor**
12. **Sv. Juraj**
13. Brušani
14. Smiljan
15. **Pag-Novalja, Vidasi**
16. Privlaka
17. Vrsi (sl. 26)
18. Dugi otok-Sali
19. Galovac
20. Bjelina
21. Mandalina
22. Krković
23. Piramatovci
24. Tiškovac
25. Topolje
26. Drniš, Balina Glavica
27. Vojnić, Gardun
28. Salapia (sl. 48)

#### Lista / List 11.

**Slika 53.** Karta rasprostranjenosti tuljastih sjekira s tri točke unutar rebrastog "Y" ornamenta (nadopunjeno prema Teržan 1996; König 2004a)

**Figure 53.** Distribution map of

socketed axes with the decoration of three circles in the ribbed "Y" ornament (supplemented after Teržan 1996; König 2004a)

1. Hollern, Bruck
2. Beša, Levice
3. Keszöhidegút
4. Nijemci
5. Pečinci II
6. Poljanci IV (Miklik Lozok 2009: 101, k. 224)
7. Novi Grad, Bosanski Šamac
8. Brodski Varoš
9. Donja Dolina
10. Belica
11. Budinščina
12. Čermožiše
13. Gorenji Log
14. Krasinec
15. Malička
16. Cres-Osor
17. Seget, Dabar

#### Lista / List 12.

**Slika 56.** Karta rasprostranjenosti mačeva s balčakom u obliku čaše (nadopunjeno prema Harding 1995)

**Figure 56.** Distribution map of swords with a cup like terminal part of the hilt (supplemented after Harding 1995)

1. Moškanjci (sl. 55)
2. Vinkovci
3. Smederevo
4. Kastav
5. Grižane

#### Lista / List 13.

**Slika 58.** Karta rasprostranjenosti bojnih noževa tipa Jurjevo (prema Glogović 1993)

**Figure 58.** Distribution map of curved battle knife with a cast handle of Jurjevo type (after Glogović 1993)

1. Sv. Juraj
2. Medak
3. Đeverske
4. Nepoznata nalazišta u sjevernoj Dalmaciji, 2 primjerka / Unknown sites in northern Dalmatia, 2 examples

#### Lista / List 14.

**Slika 63.** Karta prostorne raširenosti ukrašenih falera s trnom: tip I (*Caput Adriae* ●), tip II (Picenski ■), tip III (Dinarski ▲), tip IV (Vergina ◆) (prema Blečić Kavur 2012c)

**Figure 63.** Distribution map of decorated phalera with a thorn: type I (*Caput Adriae* ●), type II (Picenum ■), type III (Dinaric ▲), type IV (Vergina ◆) (after Blečić Kavur 2012c)

1. Škocjan-Mušja jama, Brežec
2. Ljubljana, SAZU
3. Mokronog, Ostrožnik
4. Rifnik
5. Cres-Osor
6. Biljane Donje
7. Nin
8. Velika Kladuša

9. Veliki Mošunj
10. Krehin Gradac
11. Bosanski Petrovac, Smoljana
12. Kumanovo, Vojnik
13. Valandovo, Dedeli
14. Gevgelija, Suva Reka
15. Vergina
16. Basciano
17. Porto Sant'Elpidio
18. Monteroberto
19. Novilara, Servici
20. Celldömölk, Sághegy

#### Lista / List 15.

**Slika 66.** Karta rasprostranjenosti jednopetljastih polumjesečastih fibula tipa *Caput Adriae* (●) prema Teržan i tipa II4 prema Blinkenbergu/II2 prema Sapouna Sakallerakis/II2 prema Caner (▲) (nadopunjeno prema Teržan 2007)

**Figure 66.** Distribution map demonstrating the spread of crescent shaped fibulae with a single loop of the *Caput Adriae* (●) type according to Teržan and type II4 according to Blinkenberg/II2 according to Sapouna Sakallerakis/II2 according to Caner (▲) (supplemented after Teržan 2007)

1. Hallstatt
2. Bischofshofen
3. Egna, Neumarkt
4. Este
5. Montebelluna
6. Argo Concordiese
7. Tolmin
8. Most na Soči
9. Ljubljana
10. Šmihel
11. Škocjan-Brežec
12. Ilirska Bistrica, Trnovo
13. Bari, Andria
14. Mulino della Badia
15. Thásos
16. Argissa Magoula
17. Lefkandí
18. Néa Ionía
19. Ikaría-Nas
20. İzmir
21. Efes
22. Ksánthos
23. Knídos
24. Ródos-Ialysós
25. Kríti-Kavousi
26. Kríti-Fortetsa
27. Kríti-Pigaiðhákia
28. Kríti-Vrokastro
29. Kríti-Praisós
30. Kýpros-Koúrión
31. Kýpros-Idálion (SCE 1935: Pl. CLXXVII: 3)
32. Rijeka

#### Lista / List 16.

**Slika 72.** Karta rasprostranjenosti zmijastih dvodijelnih fibula s obzirom na tipologiju igala kao na slici 71; varijanta I (●) i varijanta II (■)

**Figure 72.** Distribution map of the two-part serpentine fibulae of the variant I (●) and variant II (■); as it is shown on fig. 71

1. Škocjan-Brežec (sl. 71)

2. Grižane
3. Krk-Garica
4. Cres-Osor
5. Pag-Novalja, Dabi
6. Klačenica
7. Kompolje
8. Bilaj
9. Drvar (sl. 71)
10. Krneza, Jokina Glavica (Marijanović 2012: 23-25, T. II: 2a-b; T. III; T. IV) (sl. 73)
11. Nin (sl. 71)
12. Biljani Donji (sl. 71)
13. Benkovac (sl. 71)
14. Piramatovci (Grubač, Stipaničev 2001) (sl. 73)
15. Split
16. Nepoznato nalazište? / unknown site? (sl. 71)

#### Lista / List 17.

**Slika 76.** Karta distribucije polumjesečastih britvi tipa Oblekovice s ravnom drškom i trapezastim zaključkom karike (●) i tipa Fontanella s tordiranom ručkom i s roščićima na zaključku karike (■) (nadopunjeno prema Bianco Peroni 1979; Weber 1996)

**Figure 76.** Distribution map of semilunate-shaped razors of Oblekovice type with a straight handle and trapezoidal ring at the end (●) and razors of Fontanella type with a twisted handle and horns on the ring at the end (■) (supplemented after Bianco Peroni 1979; Weber 1996)

1. Oblekovice
2. Čehovice, Dornamyslice
3. Stramberk
4. Blatnica
5. Aszód
6. Maribor
7. Brinjeva Gora
8. Ljubljana
9. Velika Gorica
10. Škocjan-Ponikve
11. Elleri, S. Barbara (Montagnari Kokelj 1997: T. 23: 16: 3)
12. Krk-Garica
13. Picugi? (Mihovilić 2013: 146, Sl. 84; Sl. 71.)
14. Terviso?
15. San Giorgio di Angarano
16. Vadena (Negroni Catacchio et al. 1979: 81, Fig. 75)
17. Fontanella Mantovana
18. Gazzo, Ponte Nuovo (Salzani 2001: 79, Fig. 3B; Salzani 2002b: Fig. 2: 2)
19. Frattesina
20. Villamarzana
21. Forlimpopoli (Miari et al. 2010)
22. Limone
23. Bismantova
24. Estavqyer-le-Lac

#### Lista / List 18.

**Slika 81.** Karta rasprostranjenosti igala tipa Sirolo Numana: I. (●), II. (■) i III. (▲) varijante (nadopunjeno prema Lucentini 2007)

**Figure 81.** Distribution map of the pins of the Sirolo Numana

type: I. (●), II. (■) and III. (▲) variants (supplemented after Lucentini 2007)

1. Cjastiei di Pozzuolo
2. Škocjan-Brežec, Mušja jama
3. Elleri, S. Barbara (Montagnari Kokelj 1997: T. 22: 18)
4. Buje, Kaštelir
5. Nova Vas, Kaštelir (sl. 80)
6. Pizugi (sl. 80)
7. Limska Gradina (sl. 80)
8. Cres-Cres
9. Cres-Osor
10. Kompolje (Lo Schiavo 1970: 463; Drechsler-Bižić 1987: 400)
11. Jezerine
12. Zvonigrad (AMZ, neobjavljeno/unpublished)
13. Ljubuč (Batović 1981: Sl. 10: 33-34)
14. Nin
15. Ascoli Piceno
16. Numana
17. Numana, Giardini

#### Lista / List 19.

**Slika 82.** Karta rasprostranjenosti glasičnog tipa igala (●) te lokalnih varijanti tipa Gorica (■) i Colli del Tronto (▲)

**Figure 82.** Distribution map of the Glasinac type pins (●) and the local variants of Gorica (■) and Colli del Tronto types (▲)

1. Arareva gromila (Benac, Čović 1957: 20, T. XXXI: 6) (sl. 83)
2. Ilijak (Benac, Čović 1957: 12, T. XX: 7, 9)
3. Gotovuša (Marković 1966: T. II: 15)
4. Lofkënd, Apollonia (Papadopoulos et al. 2007: 127, Fig. 26: b) (sl. 84)
5. Gorica (Truhelka 1902: 29-30, T. II: 10-11; Čović 1987: T. XLVIII: 12)
6. Drinovci, Ljubuški (Truhelka 1902: 30, Fig. 51)
7. Korita (Govedarica 1982: T. XIV: 2)
8. Debelo brdo (Fiala 1894: T. XII: 7)
9. Mekota, Gornji Rakani (Mulabdić 2011: T. III: 3)
10. Colli del Tronto (Lucentini 2002: 46, Fig. 55) (sl. 84)



## Literatura / Literature

### **Alebić-Juretić 1998.**

A. Alebić-Juretić, O radu kluba za prirodne znanosti u Rijeci, Prirodoslovna istraživanja riječkog područja, Prirodoslovna biblioteka 1, Rijeka, 1998, 77-84.

### **Andrea 1976**

Z. Andrea, La civilisation tumulaire du bassin de Korçe et sa place dans les Balkans du sud-est, Iliria 4, 1976, 133-155.

### **Angelini, Bellintani 2005**

I. Angelini, P. Bellintani, Archaeological ambers from Northern Italy: An FTIR-DRIFT study of provenance by comparison with geological amber database, Archaeometry 47,2, 2005, 441-454.

### **Angelini, Polla, Giussani, Bellintani, Artioli 2009**

I. Angelini, A. Polla, B. Giussani, P. Bellintani, G. Artioli, Final Bronze-Age glass in northern and central Italy: is Frattesina the only glass production centre? Proceedings Actes ISA 2006, 36th International Symposium on Archaeometry, Quebec, 2006, 329-337.

### **Bader 1991**

T. Bader, Die Schwerter in Rumänien, Prähistorische Bronzefunde IV/8, Stuttgart, 1991.

### **Bakarić 1993**

L. Bakarić, Fibula, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, Izbor iz fundusa, Zagreb, 1993.

### **Bakarić 2004a**

L. Bakarić, Japodska kultura, u: Pretpovijesna zbirka-Vodič 3, (ed. J. Balen), Zagreb, 2004, 89-115.

### **Bakarić 2004b**

L. Bakarić, Izbor iz ostave Drežnik – Gajina pećina, Slunj, u: Ratnici na razmeđu Istoka i Zapada. Starije željezno doba u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj, (ed. D. Balen-Letunić), Zagreb, 2004, 357.

### **Bakarić 2008**

L. Bakarić, 139. Kampfmesser-Katalog, u: Dreitausend Jahre Vorgeschichte: Meisterwerke der Metallzeit im kontinentalen Kroatien, Keltenmuseum Hochdorf/Enz, 2008, 194.

### **Baldelli 1999**

G. Baldelli, Großer Ring mit eingehängten Ringen 600. u. 601. Ring mit eingehängten Ringen, u: Katalog, Die Picener. Ein Volk Europas, Frankfurt, 1999, 275.

### **Balen-Letunić 1986**

D. Balen-Letunić, Revizijska iskopavanja tumula starijeg željeznog doba u Dugoj gori, Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva 10, Zagreb, 1986, 45-58.

### **Balen-Letunić 2008**

D. Balen-Letunić, Vorwort – Ein Gang durch die Vorgeschichte im kontinentalen Kroatien, u: Dreitausend Jahre Vorgeschichte: Meisterwerke der Metallzeit im kontinentalen Kroatien, Keltenmuseum Hochdorf/Enz, 2008, 19-27.

### **Barbarić 2009**

V. Barbarić, Late Bronze Age in Dalmatia: State of Research, u: Dall'Egeo all'Adriatico: organizzazioni sociali, modi di scambio e interazione in eta postpalaziale (XII-XI sec. a.C.), Atti del Seminario internazionale (Udine, 1-2. 12. 2006), (ed. E. Borgna, P. Càssola Guida), Studi di ricerche di protostoria Mediterranea 8, Roma, 2009, 311-323.

### **Barrett 1989**

J. Barrett, Food, Gender and Metal: Questions of social reproduction, u: The Bronze Age-Iron Age Transition in Europe. Aspects of continuity and change in European societies c. 1200 to 500 B.C., (ed. M. L. Stig Sørensen, R. Thomas), BAR International Series 483 (ii), Oxford, 1989, 304-320.

### **Batović 1965**

Š. Batović, Die Eisenzeit auf dem Gebiet des Illyrischen Stammes der Liburnen, Archaeologia Iugoslavica 6, Bonn, 1965, 55-70.

### **Batović 1968**

Š. Batović, Nin u prapovijesti - Problemi arheoloških istraživanja, Zadar, 1968.

### **Batović 1976**

Š. Batović, Le relazioni culturali tra le due sponde adriatiche nell'età del ferro, u: Jadranska obala u protohistoriji. Kulturni i etnički problemi, Simpozij održan u Dubrovniku, (ed. B. Čečuk, N. Majnarić-Pandžić, V. Miroslavljević, M. Suić), Zagreb, 1976, 11-94.

### **Batović 1980**

Š. Batović, L'età del bronzo recente sulla costa orientale dell'Adriatico, Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja XVIII-16, Sarajevo, 1980, 21-62.

**Batović 1981**

Š. Batović, Nakit u prapovijesti sjeverne Dalmacije, u: Nakit na tlu sjeverne Dalmacije od prapovijesti do danas, (ed. Š. Batović), Zadar, 1981, 94-115.

**Batović 1982**

Š. Batović, Kultura starih Liburna, Dometi 12, Rijeka, 1982, 7-40.

**Batović 1983**

Š. Batović, Kasno brončano doba na istočnom Jadranskom primorju, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja IV – Brončano doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1983, 271-373.

**Batović 1986**

Š. Batović, Dalmatska kultura želznog doba, Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru 25(12), Zadar, 1985-1986, 5-60.

**Batović 1987a**

Š. Batović, Liburnska grupa, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja V – Željezno doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1987, 339-390.

**Batović 1987b**

Š. Batović, Istarska kultura želznog doba, Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru 26 (13), Zadar, 1987, 5-74.

**Batović 1987c**

Š. Batović, Prapovijesni ostaci na otoku Rabu, u: Rapski zbornik. Zbornik radova sa Znanstvenog skupa o otoku Rabu održanog od 25. do 27. 10. 1984. godine, (ed. A. Mohorovičić), Zagreb-Rab, 1987, 147-170.

**Batović 2003**

Š. Batović, Stanje istraživanja prapovijesti na kvarnerskim otocima, Diadora 21, Zadar, 2003, 253-348.

**Battaglia 1927**

R. Battaglia, Necropoli e Castelleri dell'età del ferro del Carnaro, Bulletino di Paleologia Italiana 47, Roma, 1927, 93-115.

**Battaglia 1958**

R. Battaglia, I castelleri della Venezia Giulia, Le meraviglie del passato 2, Milano, 1958, 419-434.

**Belar 1895**

A. Belar, Das Gradišće auf Fiumar Gebiet, Argo 8/4, Ljubljana, 1895, 161-166.

**Belardelli, Giardino, Malizia 1990**

C. Belardelli, C. Giardino, A. Malizia, L'Europa a sud e nord delle Alpi alle soglie della svolta protourbana, Treviso, 1990.

**Bellintani, Peretto 1984**

G. F. Bellintani, R. Peretto, Il ripostiglio di Frattesina ed altri manufatti enei raccolti in superficie, Padusa XX, Pisa-Roma, 1984, 55-72.

**Bellintani 1992**

P. Bellintani, Frattesina di Fratta Polesine: il materiale ceramico conservato presso il Museo Civico di Rovigo. Classificazione, suddivisione in fasi e alcune considerazioni sulla cronologia del Bronzo Finale nella pianura Padana orinetale, Padusa XXVIII, Pisa-Roma, 1992, 245-297.

**Bellintani 1997**

P. Bellintani, Frattesina: l'ambra e la produzione vitrea nel contesto delle relazioni transalpine, u: Ori delle Alpi, Quaderni della Sezione Archeologica Castello del Buonconsiglio, (ed. L. Endrizzi, F. Marzatico), Monumenti e collezioni provinciali 6, Trento, 1997, 117-129.

**Bellintani 2010**

P. Bellintani, Ambra. Una materia prima dal nord (ma non solo), u: Ambra per Agamennone. Indigeni e Micenei tra Egeo, Ionio e Adriatico nel II millennio a.C., (ed. A. Cazzella, G. Recchia), Bari, 2010, 139-144.

**Bellintani 2011**

P. Bellintani, Progetto "Materiali vetrosi della protostoria italiana", Aggiornamenti e stato della ricerca, Rivista di scienze preistoriche LXI, Firenze, 2011, 257-281.

**Bellintani, Angelini, Artioli, Polla 2006**

P. Bellintani, I. Angelini, G. Artioli, A. Polla, Origini dei materiali vetrosi italiani: esotismi e localismi, Atti della Riunione Scientifica dell'Istituto Italiano di Preistoria e Protostoria XXXIX, Firenze, 2006, 1495-1533.

**Bellintani, Stefan 2009**

P. Bellintani, L. Stefan, Nuovi dati sul primo vetro europeo: il caso di Frattesina, u: Atti del Primo Convegno Interdisciplinare sul Vetro nei Beni Culturali e nell'Arte di ieri e di Oggi, Parma, 27-28 novembre 2008, Parma, 2009, 71-86.

**Bellintani, Usai, Fadda 2012**

P. Bellintani, A. Usai, M. A. Fadda, Materiali vetrosi protostorici della Sardegna: inquadramento crono-tipologico e considerazioni sulle relazioni tra Mediterraneo centrale e orientale, Atti della Riunione Scientifica dell'Istituto Italiano di Preistoria e Protostoria XLIV, Firenze, 2012, 1121-1130.

**Benac, Čović 1957**

A. Benac, B. Čović, Glasinac-Teil II Eisenzeit. Katalog der vorgeschichtlichen Sammlung des Landesmuseums in Sarajevo 2, Sarajevo, 1957.

**Č. Benac 1988**

Č. Benac, Geološka prošlost Rijeke, u: Povijest Rijeke, Rijeka, 1988, 7-22.

**Č. Benac 1996**

Č. Benac, Morfološka evolucija Riječkog zaljeva: utjecaj klimatskih i glacioeustatičkih promjena, Acta Geographica Croatica 31, Zagreb, 1996, 69-84.

**Č. Benac 2001**

Č. Benac, Geološka građa i geomorfološka evolucija liburnijske obale, Bilten, Lovran i more, Lovran, 2001, 5-7.

**Č. Benac, Juračić 1998**

Č. Benac, M. Juračić, Geomorphological indicators of the sea level changes during Upper Pleistocene (Würm) and Holocene in the Kvarner region, Acta Geographica Croatica 33, Zagreb, 1998, 27-45.

**Č. Benac, Ružić, Žic 2006**

Č. Benac, I. Ružić, E. Žic, Ranjivost obala na području Kvarnera, Pomorski zbornik 44,1, Rijeka, 2006, 201-214.

**Benndorf 1880**

O. von Benndorf, Ausgrabungen in Ossero, Archaeologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Österreich IV, Wien, 1880, 73-82.

**Berezanskaja, Kločko 1998**

S. S. Berezanskaja, V. I. Kločko, Das Gräberfeld von Hordeevka, Archäologie in Euroasien 5, Rahden/Westfalen, 1998.

**Bergonzi 1997**

G. Bergonzi, L'ambra delle terramare nel contesto italiano ed europeo, u: Le Terramare. La più antica civiltà padana, (ed. M. Bernabò Brea, A. Cardarelli, M. Cremaschi), Katalog izložbe, Modena, 1997, 602-609.

**Bettelli 2002**

M. Bettelli, Italia meridionale e mondo miceneo. Ricerche su dinamiche di acculturazione e aspetti archeologici, con particolare riferimento ai versanti adriatico e ionico della penisola italiana, *Grandi contesti e problemi della Protostoria italiana* 5, Roma, 2002.

**Betzler 1974**

P. Betzler, Die Fibeln in Süddeutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz I, *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* XIV/3, München, 1974.

**Bianchin Citton 1984**

E. Bianchin Citton, Il Bronzo finale in Il Veneto nell'Antichità, *Preistoria e Protostoria* II, Verona, 1984, 617-630.

**Bianchin Citton 1987**

E. Bianchin Citton, Rapporti tra Veneto ed Etruria mineraria nel Bronzo Finale e agli inizi dell'età del Ferro, u: *Gli Etruschi a nord del Po. I.* (ed. R. C. De Marinis), Mantova, 1987, 40-51.

**Bianchin Citton 1998**

E. Bianchin Citton, La documentazione archeologica dell'abitato di Montagnana-Borgo San Zenò. I bronzi, u: ...«presso l'Adige ridente»... Recenti rinvenimenti archeologici da Este a Montagnana, (ed. E. Bianchin Citton, G. Gambacurta, A. Ruta Serafini), Padova, 1998, 280-294.

**Bianchin Citton 2006**

E. Bianchin Citton, Via S. Pietro – Fondo Corbetta, u: *Concordia Sagittaria, La Protostoria tra Sile e Tagliamento. Antiche genti tra Veneto e Friuli*, *Cataloghi* 2, Padova, 2006, 264-270.

**Bianchin Citton 2009**

E. Bianchin Citton, Il Veneto tra Bronzo Recente e Bronzo Finale: popolamento e aspetti socio-economici di un'area di cerniera tra l'Adriatico e l'Oltralpe, u: *Dall'Egeo all'Adriatico: organizzazioni sociali, modi di scambio e interazione in età postpalaziale (XII-XI sec. a.C.)*, *Atti del Seminario internazionale* (Udine, 1-2. 12. 2006), (ed. E. Borgna, P. Càssola Guida), *Studi di ricerche di protostoria Mediterranea* 8, Roma, 2009, 257-271.

**Bianco Peroni 1970**

V. Bianco Peroni, Die Schwerter in Italien/Le spade nell'Italia continentale, *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* IV/1, München, 1970.

**Bianco Peroni 1979**

V. Bianco Peroni, I Rasoi nell'Italia continentale, *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* VIII/2, München, 1979.

**Bietti Sestieri 1973**

A. M. Bietti Sestieri, The metal industry of continental Italy, 13th to the 11th century BC, and its connections with the Aegean, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 39, London, 1973, 383-424.

**Bietti Sestieri 1984**

A. M. Bietti Sestieri, L'abitato di Fratessina, *Padusa* XX, Pisa-Roma, 1984, 413-427.

**Bietti Sestieri 1992**

A. M. Bietti Sestieri, The Iron Age community of Osteria dell'Ossa. A study of socio-political development in central Tyrrhenian Italy, *New Studies in Archaeology*, Cambridge, 1992.

**Bietti Sestieri 1992**

A. M. Bietti Sestieri, (ed.), *La necropoli Laziale di Osteria dell'Osa*, Roma, 1992.

**Bietti Sestieri 1997**

A. M. Bietti Sestieri, Il territorio padano dopo le terramare, u: *Le Terramare. La più antica civiltà padana*, (ed. M. Bernabò Brea, A. Cardarelli, M. Cremaschi), Modena, 1997, 757-770.

**Bietti Sestieri 1999**

A. M. Bietti Sestieri, Vor den Picener, u: *Die Picener. Ein Volk Europas*, Frankfurt, 1999, 36-452.

**Bietti Sestieri 2008**

A. M. Bietti Sestieri, L'età del Bronzo finale nella penisola Italiana, *Padusa* XLIV, Pisa-Roma, 2008, 7-54.

**Bietti Sestieri, Lo Schiavo 1976**

A. M. Bietti Sestieri, F. Lo Schiavo, Alcuni problemi relativi ai rapporti fra l'Italia e la Penisola Balcanica nella tarda età del bronzo inizi dell'età del ferro, *Iliria* 4, Tiranë, 1976, 163-189.

**Binford 1989**

L. R. Binford, *Debating Archaeology*, *Studies in Archaeology*, San Diego, 1989.

**Blečić 2002**

M. Blečić, Kastav u posljednjem tisućljeću prije Krista, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja Zagreb*, 3. s. 35, Zagreb, 2002, 65-146.

**Blečić 2007a**

M. Blečić, Reflections of Picens impact in the Kvarner Bay, u: *Piceni ed Europa, Atti del convegno*, (ed. M. Guštin, P. Ettel, M. Buora), *Archeologia di frontiera* 6, Udine, 2007, 109-122.

**Blečić 2007b**

M. Blečić, Osor on Cres, u: *One Hundred Croatian Archeological Sites*, (ed. A. Durman), Zagreb, 2007, 200-201.

**Blečić 2007c**

M. Blečić, Primorsko-goranska County, *One Hundred Croatian Archeological Sites*, (ed. A. Durman), Zagreb, 2007, 30-33.

**Blečić 2009**

M. Blečić, The significance of Amber in Kvarner region, u: *Amber in Archaeology. Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Amber in Archaeology*, Belgrade 2006. (ed. A. Palavestra, C. W. Beck, J. M. Todd), Beograd, 2009, 142-155.

**Blečić Kavur 2011**

M. Blečić Kavur, The fastest way to the Big Sea: A contribution to the knowledge about the influence of the UFC on the territory of the northern Adriatic, u: *Beiträge zur Mittel- und Spätbronzezeit sowie zur Urnenfelderzeit am Rande der Südostalpen*, *Akten des 1. Wildoner Fachgespräches vom 25. bis 26. Juni 2009 in Wildon/Steiermark (Österreich)*, (ed. Ch. Gutjahr, G. Tiefengraber), Rahden/Westfalen, 2011, 51-62.

**Blečić Kavur 2012a**

M. Blečić Kavur, Caput Adriae in kultura mediteranstva. Egejski elementi pozne bronaste dobe na severnem Jadranu in v njegovem zaledju, u: *Potopljena preteklost: arheologija vodnih okolij in raziskovanje podvodne kulturne dediščine v Sloveniji*, (ed. A. Gaspari, M. Erič), *Radovljica*, 2012, 101-108.

**Blečić Kavur 2012b**

M. Blečić Kavur, Plovidba duž Caput Adriae: plovidba Svijetom?, *Histria antiqua* 21, Pula, 2010, 215-229.



#### **Blečić Kavur 2012c**

M. Blečić Kavur, Ukrašene bronzane falere s trnom: ornament kao amblem, *Godišnjak* 41, Sarajevo, 2012, 43-66.

#### **Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013**

Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2013, M. Blečić Kavur, B. Kavur, The Amphora from Osor, *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 19, Zagreb, 2013, 209-214.

#### **Blečić Kavur, Kavur 2014**

M. Blečić Kavur, B. Kavur, The Game of glass beads in the attire of the cultures of Caput Adriae and its hinterland, u: *Annales of the 19th Congress of the International Association for the History of Glass*. Piran, Slovenia 2012, (ed. I. Lazar), Koper, 2014 (in press).

#### **Blečić Kavur, Podrug 2014**

M. Blečić Kavur, E. Podrug, Nekropola gradine Velika Mrdakovica – grobovi starijeg željeznog doba, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku* 107, Split, 2014 (in press).

#### **Bodinaku 1990**

N. Bodinaku, Kama bronzi nga Shqipëria jugore (Sprovë për një rishqyrtim tipologjik të tyre), *Iliria* 1, Tiranë, 1990, 85-97.

#### **Borgna 1992**

E. Borgna, Il ripostiglio di Madriolo presso Cividale e i pani a piccone del Friuli-Venezia Giulia, *Studi e ricerche di Protostoria mediterranea* 1, Roma, 1992.

#### **Borgna 1999**

E. Borgna, The North Adriatic regions between Europe and the Aegean World (12th–8th CA.): Social strategies and Symbols of Power in the Long-Distance Exchange, u: *Eliten in der Bronzezeit, Ergebnisse zweier Kolloquien in Mainz und Athen, Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseum* 43, Mainz, 1999, 151-183.

#### **Borgna 2000**

E. Borgna, Osservazioni sulla presenza egeo-cipriota nella metallurgia delle regioni comprese tra l'Alto Adriatico e l'Europa centrale, u: *Ancient Metallurgy between Oriental Alps and Pannonian Plain. Workshop, Trieste, 29-30 October 1998*, (ed. A. Giunilia-Mair), Trieste, 2000, 41-51.

#### **Borgna 2001**

E. Borgna, I ripostigli del Friuli: proposta di seriazione cronologica e di interpretazione funzionale, *Rivista di Scienze Preistoriche* LI, Firenze, 2001, 289-335.

#### **Borgna 2009**

E. Borgna, Patterns of bronze circulation and deposition in the northern Adriatic at the close of the Late Bronze Age, u: *Dall'Egeo all'Adriatico: organizzazioni sociali, modi di scambio e interazione in eta postpalaziale (XII-XI sec. a.C.)*, *Atti del Seminario internazionale (Udine, 1-2. 12. 2006)*, (ed. E. Borgna, P. Càssola Guida), *Studi di ricerche di protostoria Mediterranea* 8, Roma, 2009, 289-309.

#### **Borgna, Turk 1998**

E. Borgna, P. Turk, Metal Exchange and the Circulation of Bronze Objects between central Italy and the Caput Adriae (XI-VIIIth centuries BC): Implications for the Community Organisation, u: *The Bronze Age in Europe and the Mediterranean, UISPP, Atti del XIII Congresso, Vol. 4*, (ed. R. C. De Marinis, A. M. Bietti Sestieri, R. Peroni, C. Peretto), Forlì, 1998, 351-364.

#### **Borgna, Montagnari Kokelj 1999**

E. Borgna, E. Montagnari Kokelj, Nuove ricerche su complessi protostorici ai confini settentrionali dell'Istria, u: *Protostoria e storia del „Venetorum Angulus“*, (ed. O. Paoletti), *Atti del XX Convegno di Studi Etruschi ed Italici, Portogruaro-Quattro D'Altino-Este-Adria* 16-19. 09. 1996, Pisa – Roma, 1999, 131-156.

#### **Boroffka 2001**

N. Boroffka, Bemerkungen zu einigen Bernsteinfunden aus Rumänien, *Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt* 31, Mainz, 2001, 395-409.

#### **Bouzek 1985**

J. Bouzek, The Aegean, Anatolian and Europe: Cultural Interrelations in the Second Millenium B.C., *Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology* 29, Göteborg-Praha, 1985.

#### **Bradley 1998**

R. Bradley, The Passage of Arms: An Archaeological analysis of prehistoric hoards and votive deposits, Oxford, 1998.

#### **Bricelj 2003**

M. Bricelj, Žarno grobišče s Kapitelske njive v Novem Mestu, *Diplomsko delo*, Univerza v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, 2003.

#### **Bruno 2012**

A. Bruno, Spears in context: typology, life-cycles and social meanings in Bronze Age Italy, PhD Thesis, University of Manchester, Manchester, 2012.

#### **Brunšmid 1901**

J. Brunšmid, Groblje bronzanog doba na Klačenci kod Jablanca (kotar Senj) – Povijest mjesta Jablanca, *Viestnik hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva, N.s.V.*, Zagreb, 1901, 53-62.

#### **Brusić 1988**

Z. Brusić, Otok Rab-rekognosciranje gradina, *Aheološki pregled*, Ljubljana, 1988/1990, 229-232.

#### **Brusić 2000**

Z. Brusić, Nekropola gradine kod Dragišća, *Radovi Filozofskog Fakulteta u Zadru* 38(25), Zadar, 1999-2000, 1-15.

#### **Budd, Taylor 1995**

P. Budd, T. Taylor, The faerie smith meets the bronze industry: magic versus science in the interpretation of prehistoric metal-making, *World Archaeology* 27,1, London, 1995, 133-143.

#### **Buršić-Matijašić 1997**

K. Buršić-Matijašić, Ceramica del castelliere di Monte Orcino in Istria, *Histria Archaeologica* 28, Pula, 1997-1999, 108-134.

#### **Buršić-Matijašić 1998**

K. Buršić-Matijašić, Gradina Monkodonja: tipološko-statistička obrada keramičkih nalaza srednjobrončanodobne istarske gradine Monkodonja kod Rovinja, *Monografije i katalozi* 9, Pula, 1998.

#### **Buršić-Matijašić 2007**

K. Buršić-Matijašić, Gradine Istre. Povijest prije povijesti, *Povijest Istre* VI, Pula, 2007.

#### **Buršić-Matijašić 2010**

K. Buršić-Matijašić, Nalaz bronzanih predmeta s otoka Krka, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu* 27, Zagreb, 2010, 73-82.

#### **Burton 1877**

R. Burton, Scoperte antropologiche in Ossero, *Archeografo Triestino, II S.V.*, Trieste, 1877, 129-134.

#### **Cappellari 1895**

G. Cappellari, I Castellieri nel territorio di Fiume, *La Bilancia* an.28., Rijeka, 22.10. 1895: 2.

#### **Carancini 1975**

G. L. Carancini, Die Nadeln in Italien/Gli spilloni nell'Italia continentale, *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* XIII/2, München, 1975.

#### **Carancini, G. L., Peroni 1999**

G. L. Carancini, R. Peroni, L'eta' del bronzo in Italia: Per una cronologia della produzione metallurgica, *Quaderni di protostoria* 2, Roma, 1999.

#### **Cardarelli 1983**

A. Cardarelli, Castellieri nel Carso e nell'Istria: Cronologia degli insediamenti fra media età del bronzo e prima età de ferro, u: *Preistoria del Caput Adriae*, (ed. C. Russo, A. Boiardi), Udine–Trieste, 1983, 87-117.

#### **Catarsi, Dall'Aglio 1978**

M. Catarsi, P. L. Dall'Aglio, La necropoli protovillanoviana di Campo Pianelli di Bismantova, Cataloghi dei Civici Musei 4, Reggio Emilia, 1978.

#### **Catling 1975**

H. W. Catling, The Iron Age, u: A. C. Brown and H. W. Catling, Ancient Cyprus, Oxford, 1975.

#### **Cestnik 2010**

V. Cestnik, Željeznodobna nekropola Kaštel kod Buja, Monografije i katalozi 18, Pula, 2010.

#### **Clausing 2003**

C. Clausing, Ein Urnenfelderzeitlicher Hortfund von Slavonki Brod, Kroatien, Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum 50,1, Mainz, 2003, 47-205.

#### **Cosentino 1999**

S. Cosentino, Nekropole von Celano, Grab 4. u: Katalog, Die Picener. Ein Volk Europas, Frankfurt, 1999, 183-184.

#### **Crnčić 1886**

I. Crnčić, Još o Belom, Viestnik hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva VIII, Zagreb, 1886, 66-72.

#### **Cultraro 2006**

M. Cultraro, I vaghi di ambra del tipo Tirinto nella protostoria italiana: nuovi dati dall'area egeo-balcanica, u: Materie prime e scambi nella preistoria italiana, Atti della XXXIX Riunione Scientifica dell'Istituto Italiano di Preistoria e Protostoria 3, Firenze, 2006, 1533-1553.

#### **Čaval 1983**

J. Čaval, Stanovništvo i privreda Grobinštine, Rijeka, 1983.

#### **Čerče, Šinkovec 1995**

P. Čerče, I. Šinkovec, Katalog depojev pozne bronaste dobe (5. Čremožiše, 15. Jurka vas), u: Depojske in posamezne kovinske najdbe bakrene in bronaste dobe na Slovenskem I, (ed. B. Teržan), Katalogi in Monografije 29, Ljubljana 1995, 138-147, 197-203.

#### **Čović 1965**

B. Čović, Uvod u startigrafiju i hronologiju praistorijskih gradina u Bosni, Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine XX, Sarajevo, 1965, 27-145.

#### **Čović 1971a**

B. Čović, Vodeći arheološki tipovi kasnog bronzanog doba na području Delmata, Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja VIII-6, Sarajevo, 1971, 67-97.

#### **Čović 1971b**

B. Čović, Nalaz praistorijskog nakita iz Otoka (Vitina), Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine XXVI, Sarajevo, 1971, 301-312.

#### **Čović 1980**

B. Čović, Počeci metalurgije željeza na sjeverozapadnom Balkanu, Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja 18-16, Sarajevo, 1980, 63-80.

#### **Čović 1983**

B. Čović, Srednjobosanska kulturna grupa, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih zemalja IV – Brončano doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1983, 433-457.

#### **Čović 1984**

B. Čović, Umjetnost kasnog bronzanog i starijeg željeznog doba na istočnoj jadranskoj obali i u njenom zaleđu, u: Simpozijum Duhovna kultura Ilira, (ed. A. Benac), Posebna izdanja Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja LXVII/11, Sarajevo, 1984, 7-40.

#### **Čović 1986**

B. Čović, Die Ethnogenese der Illyrier aus der Sicht der Vor- und Frühgeschichte, u: Ethnogenese europäischer Völker. Aus der Sicht der Anthropologie und Vor- und Frühgeschichte (eds. W. Bernhard, A. Kandler-Pálsson), Stuttgart-New York, 55-74.

#### **Čović 1987**

B. Čović, Glasinačka kultura, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja V – Željezno doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1987, 575-643.

#### **Črešnar 2006**

M. Črešnar, Novi žarni grobovi iz Ruš in pogrebni običaji v ruški žarnogrobni skupini, Arheološki vestnik 57, Ljubljana, 2006: 97-162.

#### **Ćus-Rukonić 1981**

J. Ćus-Rukonić, Neki prapovijesni nalazi u Arheološkoj zbirci u Osoru, Histria Archaeologica 11-12, Pula, 1981, 5-15.

#### **Ćus-Rukonić 1982**

J. Ćus-Rukonić, Arheološka topografija otoka Cresa i Lošinja, Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva 7, Zagreb, 1982, 9-17.

#### **Ćus-Rukonić 1998**

J. Ćus-Rukonić, A review of settlement, society and economy on the Island of Cres and Lošinj in Prehistory and Protohistory, u: XIII International congress of Prehistory and Protohistory sciences Forli, 8-14. 09. 1996., (ed. C. Arias, A. Bietti, L. Castelletti, C. Peretto), Forli, 1998, 483-488.

#### **Ćus-Rukonić 2005**

J. Ćus-Rukonić, Carlo Marchesetti, Vladimir Miroslavljević e Nikola Stražičić: I castellieri sull'arcipelago di Cres (Cherso) e Lošinj (Lussino), u: Carlo Marchesetti e i castellieri, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, (ed. G. Bandelli, E. Montagnari Kokelj), Duino –Trieste, 14-15 novembre 2003, Trieste, 2005, 419-428.

#### **Ćus-Rukonić, Glogović 1989**

J. Ćus-Rukonić, D. Glogović, Pregled nalaza i nalazišta bronzanoga doba na otocima Cresu i Lošnju, Arheološki vestnik 39-40, Ljubljana, 1988-1989, 495-508.

#### **Dall'Osso 1915**

I. Dall'Osso, Guida Illustrata del Museo Nazionale di Ancona (Ristampa anastatica dell'edizione originale Ancona 1915), Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali, Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici delle Marche, Urbino, 2006.

#### **De Juliis 1979**

E. De Juliis, Il Bronzo Finale nella Puglia settentrionale, u: Il Bronzo Finale in Italia, Atti della XXI Riunione Scientifica dell'Istituto Italiano di Preistoria e Protostoria, in memoria di F. Rittatore Vonwiller, Firenze 1977, Firenze, 1979, 515-529.

#### **Della Casa 1996**

P. Della Casa, Velika Gruda II, Die bronzezeitliche Nekropole Velika Gruda, Montenegro: Fundgruppen der mittleren und späten Bronzezeit zwischen Adria und Donau, Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie 33, Bonn, 1996.

#### **De Marinis 1972**

R. C. De Marinis, Ritrovamenti dell'età del Bronzo Finale in Lombardia. Contributo alla suddivisione in periodi del Protogolasecca, Sibirivm 11, Varese, 1971-1972, 53-97

#### **De Marinis 2005**

R. C. De Marinis, Cronologia relativa, cross-dating e datazioni cronometriche tra Bronzo Finale e Primo Ferro: qualche spunto di riflessione metodologica, u: Oriente e occidente. Metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro italiana. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma 30-31 ottobre 2003, (ed. G. Bartoloni, F. Delpino), Mediterranea I, Pisa-Roma, 2005, 15-52.

**De Marinis 2007**

R. C. De Marinis, L'ambra in Italia settentrionale tra Alpi e Po durante l'età del Bronzo, u: Ambre. trasparenze dall'antico, Catalogo della mostra Napoli, 26 marzo-10 settembre 2007, (ed. M. L. Nava, A. Salerno), Napoli, 2007, 60-67.

**De Marinis, Gambari 2005**

R. C. De Marinis, G. F. Gambari, La cultura di Golasecca dal X agli inizi del VII secolo a.C.: cronologia relativa e correlazioni con altre aree culturali, u: Oriente e occidente. Metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro italiana. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma 30-31 ottobre 2003, (ed. G. Bartoloni, F. Delpino), Mediterranea I, Pisa-Roma, 2005, 197-225.

**De Min 1984**

M. De Min, La necropoli protovillanoviana di Frattesina di Fratta Polesine (Ro), Padusa XX, Pisa-Roma, 1984, 475-499.

**Demetriou 1989**

A. Demetriou, Cypro-Aegean relations in the Early Iron Age, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology LXXXIII, Göteborg, 1989.

**D' Ercole 1977**

V. D' Ercole, Cultura Picena: Oggetti in metallo, osso ed ambra, u: I materiali della collezione Guglielmo Allevi raccolti nel Museo Civico di Offida, Offida, 1977, 65-125.

**Depoli 1909**

G. Depoli, Lo spartiaque fra Quarnero e Adriatico e la sua importanza per la geografia biologica, Fiume rivista, Fiume, 1909, 42-57.

**Depoli 1913**

G. Depoli, Guida di Fiume e dei suoi monti, Fiume rivista, Fiume, 1913.

**Depoli 1928**

G. Depoli, La provincia del Carnaro. Saggio geografico, Fiume, 1928.

**Dore 2005**

A. Dore, Il Villanoviano I-III di Bologna: problemi di cronologia relativa e assoluta, u: Oriente e occidente. Metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro italiana. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma 30-31 ottobre 2003, (ed. G. Bartoloni, F. Delpino), Mediterranea I, Pisa-Roma, 2005, 255-292.

**Dörrer 2008**

O. Dörrer, Frühe Fibelformen und der Beginn der Basarabikultur in der Umgebung des Eisernen Tores, Germania 86,2, Frankfurt am Main, 2008, 541-589.

**Drechsler-Bižić 1962**

R. Drechsler-Bižić, Japodske dvodelne fibule tipa Prozor, Arheološki radovi i rasprave 2, Zagreb, 1962, 295-312.

**Drechsler-Bižić 1976**

R. Drechsler-Bižić, Porijeklo lučnih jednopetljastih fibula u Japoda, Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja XIII-11, Sarajevo, 1976, 143-151.

**Drechsler-Bižić 1980**

R. Drechsler-Bižić, Nekropola brončanog doba u pećini Bezdanjači kraj Vrhovina, Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja Zagreb 3. s. XII-XIII, Zagreb, 1979-1980, 27-77.

**Drechsler-Bižić 1983**

R. Drechsler-Bižić, Srednje brončano doba u Lici i Bosni, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja IV – Brončano doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1983, 242-270.

**Drechsler-Bižić 1987**

R. Drechsler-Bižić, Japodska grupa, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja V – Željezo doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne

i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1987, 391-441.

**Dubolnić 2006**

M. Dubolnić, Prapovijesna nalazišta na području Starigrada Paklenice, Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru 48, Zadar, 2006, 1-55.

**Dular 1974**

J. Dular, Bronasti jezičastoročajni meči iz Slovenije, u: Varia Archaeologica I, (ed. M. Guštin), Brežice, 1974, 11-29.

**Dular 1978**

J. Dular, Poskus kronološke razdelitve dobovskega žarnega grobišča, Arheološki vestnik 29, Ljubljana, 1978, 36-45.

**Dular 2002**

J. Dular, Dolnji Lakoš in mlajša bronasta doba med Muro in Savo, u: J. Dular, I. Šavel, S. Tecco Hvala, Bronastodobno naselje Oloris pri Dolnjem Lakošu, Opera Instituti Archaeologici Sloveniae 5, Ljubljana, 2002, 141-228.

**Eder, Jung 2005**

B. Eder, R. Jung, On the character of social relations between Greece and Italy in the 12th/11th cent. BC. u: Emporia, Aegeans in Central and Eastern Mediterranean, Proceedings of the 10th International Aegean Conference at the Italian School of Archaeology in Athens 2004, (ed. R. Laffineur, E. Greco), Aegaeum 25, Liège, 2005, 485-495.

**Eggert 2010**

H. Eggert, Hermeneutik, Semiotik und Kommunikationstheorie in der Prähistorischen Archäologie: Quellenkritische Erwägungen, u: Bilder in der Archäologie – eine Archäologie der Bilder?, (ed. C. Juwig, C. Kost), Tübinger archäologische Taschenbücher 8, Münster, 2010, 49-74.

**Eles Masi 1986**

P. von Eles Masi, Le fibule dell'Italia settentrionale, Prähistorische Bronzefunde XIV/5, München, 1986.

**Erbach 1995**

M. zu Erbach, Stand und Aufgaben der Urnenfelderforschung in Oberösterreich, u: Beiträge zur Urnenfelderzeit nördlich und südlich der Alpen, Ergebnisse eines Kolloquiums, (ed. M. zu Erbach), Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseum 35, Mainz 1995, 307-322.

**Faber 1965**

A. Faber, Antički bedemi grada Krka, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historijsku dalmatinsku LXV-LXVII, Split, 1965, 45-53.

**Faber 1974**

A. Faber, Osor, antički Apsorus. Istraživanje protohistorijskog i antičkog bedema i topografije grada. Nekropola iz vremena Seobe naroda, Arheološki preglad 16, Beograd, 1974, 79-81.

**Faber 1976**

A. Faber, Prilog kronologiji fortifikacija u primorskom Iliriku, u: Jadranska obala u protohistoriji. Kulturni i etnički problemi, Simpozij održan u Dubrovniku 1972., (ed. B. Čečuk, N. Majnarić-Pandžić, V. Miroslavljević, M. Suić), Zagreb, 1976, 227-246

**Faber 1980**

A. Faber, Osor-Apsorus iz aspekta antičkog pomorstva, Diadora 9, Zadar, 1980, 289-311.

**Faber 1982**

A. Faber, Počeci urbanizacije na otocima sjevernog Kvarnera. Arheološka topografija Osora, Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva 7, Zagreb, 1982, 61-78.

**Faber 2000**

A. Faber, Gradnja protohistorijskih i ranoantičkih bedema u priobalju Ilirika, Histria Antiqua 6, Pula, 2000, 145-170.

#### **Fiala 1894**

F. Fiala, Jedna prehistorička naseobina na Debelom brdu kod Sarajeva, Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja u Bosni i Hercegovini VI, Sarajevo, 1894, 107-140.

#### **Forenbaher 1995**

S. Forenbaher, Trade and Exchange in Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Croatia, u: Handel, Tausch und Verkehr im bronze- und früheisenzeitlichen Südosteuropa, (ed. B. Hänsel), Südosteuropa Schriften 17, Prähistorische Archäologie in Südosteuropa 11, München-Berlin, 1995, 269-282.

#### **Forenbaher, Vranjican 1985**

S. Forenbaher, P. Vranjican, Vaganačka pećina, Opvscvlae Archaeologica 10, Zagreb, 1985, 1-21.

#### **Forenbaher, Kaiser 2006**

S. Forenbaher, T. Kaiser, The Pottery of Pupićina Cave, u: Prehistoric Herders of Northern Istria, 1. Svezak, (ed. P. T. Miracle, S. Forenbaher), Monografije i katalozi 14, Pula, 2006, 163-223.

#### **Fortis 1771**

A. Fortis, Saggio d'osservazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Osero, Venezia, 1771.

#### **Fortis 2004**

A. Fortis, Put po Dalmaciji (Viaggio in Dalmazia, Venezia 1774. -preveo M. Maras), Split 2004.

#### **Gabrovec 1965**

S. Gabrovec, Halštatska kultura Slovenije, Arheološki vestnik 15-16, Ljubljana 1964-1965, 21-63.

#### **Gabrovec 1975**

S. Gabrovec, Začetek halštatskega obdobja v Sloveniji, Arheološki vestnik 24, Ljubljana 1973-1975, 338-385.

#### **Gabrovec 1983**

S. Gabrovec, Jugoistočnoalpska regija, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja IV – Brončano doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1983, 21-96.

#### **Gabrovec 1987a**

S. Gabrovec, Svetolucijska grupa, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja V – Željezno doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1987, 120-150.

#### **Gabrovec 1987b**

S. Gabrovec, Notranjska grupa, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja V – Željezno doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1987, 151-177.

#### **Gabrovec, Mihovilić 1987**

S. Gabrovec, K. Mihovilić, Istarska grupa, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih Zemalja V – Željezno doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1987, 293-338.

#### **Gajić-Čapka, Zaninović, Lončar 1998**

M. Gajić-Čapka, K. Zaninović, E. Lončar, Meteorološke analize i valorizacija prostora šireg područja Rijeke, Prirodoslovna istraživanja riječkog područja. Prirodoslovna biblioteka 1, Rijeka, 1998, 159-164.

#### **Gambari 2006**

F. M. Gambari, La necropoli di Morano sul Po ed il Protogolasecca in Italia nord-occidentale: definizioni, cronologia, caratteri culturali e significato storico, u: Navigando lungo l'Eridano: La necropoli protogolasecciana di Morano sul Po, (ed. M. Venturino Gambari), Casale Monferrato, 2006, 187-210.

#### **Gambari, Venturino Gambari 1997**

F. M. Gambari, M. Venturino Gambari, Gli oggetti di ornamento di Piemonte, u: Ori delle Alpe, (ed. L. Endrizzi, F. Marzatico), Trento, 1997, 334-340.

#### **Gatti, Petitti 1980**

S. Gatti, P. Petitti, Appunti di cronologia e aspetti rituali nelle necropoli istriane del Bronzo finale e dell'età del Ferro, u: Il bronzo finale in Italia, (ed. R. Peroni), Bari, 1980, 129-155.

#### **Gavranović 2011**

M. Gavranović, Die Spätbronze – und Früheisenzeit in Bosnien, Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie 195, Bonn, 2011.

#### **Giaretti, Rubat Borel 2006**

M. Giaretti, F. Rubat Borel, Le strutture e i reperti archeologici, u: Navigando lungo l'Eridano: La necropoli protogolasecciana di Morano sul Po, (ed. M. Venturino Gambari), Casale Monferrato, 2006, 83-186.

#### **Glavičić 1966**

A. Glavičić, Arheološki nalazi iz Senja i okolice I, Senjski zbornik 2, Senj, 1966, 348-426.

#### **Gleirscher 2007**

P. Gleirscher, Zum Bildprogramm der Himmelscheibe von Nebra: Schiff oder Sichel? Germania 85, Frankfurt am Main, 2007, 23-33.

#### **Glogović 1982**

D. Glogović, Predmeti starijeg željeznog doba iz grobova na Kavaneli kraj Osora, Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva 7, Zagreb, 1982, 33-42.

#### **Glogović 1987**

D. Glogović, Nalaz iz Šule na Krku i problem lučnih fibula s dva dugmeta na luku iz Liburnije, Arheološki radovi i rasprave 10, Zagreb, 1987, 73-92.

#### **Glogović 1988**

D. Glogović, Dvodijelne zmijaste fibule iz Jugoslavije, Diadora 10, Zadar, 1988, 5-18.

#### **Glogović 1989**

D. Glogović, Prilozi poznavanju željeznog doba na Sjevernom Jadranu, Hrvatsko primorje i Kvarnerski otoci, Monografije JAZU, Zavod za arheologiju 1, Zagreb, 1989.

#### **Glogović 1991**

D. Glogović, Praistorijski nakit iz Zbirke Stomorica u Novalji, Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu 8, Zagreb, 1991, 17-24.

#### **Glogović 1993**

D. Glogović, Knives of The Sv. Juraj type from Liburnia, u: Actes du XIIe Congrès International des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques, Bratislava 01-07. 09. 1991, (ed. J. Pavuk), Bratislava, 1993, 239-243.

#### **Glogović 1997**

D. Glogović, Fibule iz Ljubča, Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu 13-14, Zagreb, 1996-1997, 33-40.

#### **Glogović 2000**

D. Glogović, Brončanodobne ostave iz Dalmacije, Opvscvla Archaeologica 23-24, Zagreb, 1999-2000, 11-21.

#### **Glogović 2003**

D. Glogović, Fibeln im kroatischen Küstengebiet (Istrien, Dalmatien), Prähistorische Bronzefunde XIV/13, Stuttgart, 2003.

#### **Godelier 1999**

M. Godelier, The Enigma of the Gift, Chicago, 1999.

#### **Gosden, Marschall 1999**

C. Gosden, Y. Marschall, The cultural biography of objects, World Archaeology 31,2, London 1999, 169-178.

#### Govedarica 1982

B. Govedarica, Prilozi kulturnoj stratigrafiji praistorijskih gradinskih naselja u jugozapadnoj Bosni, Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja XX-18 Sarajevo, 111-188.

#### Gramsch, Meier 2013

A. Gramsch, T. Meier, An archaeological outline of ritual dynamics and social space, u: Counterpoint. Essays in Archaeology and Heritage Studies in Honour of Professor Kristian Kristiansen, (ed. S. Bergerbrant, S. Sabatini), Oxford, 2013, 193-198.

#### Grubač, Stipaničev 2001

J. Grubač, N. Stipaničev, Šetnja kroz tisućljeća, Slobodna Dalmacija, utork, 2. siječnja 2001, 13 (= <http://arhiv.slobodnadalmacija.hr/20010102/sibenik.htm>) (11. 09. 2012).

#### Guggisberg 2004

M. Guggisberg, Keimelia: Altstücke in fürstlichen Gräbern diesseits und jenseits der Alpen, u: Die Hydria von Grächwil. Zur funktion und rezeption mediteraner Importe in Mitteleuropa im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr., (ed. M. A. Guggisberg), Schriften des Bernischen Historischen Museums 5, Bern 2004, 175-192.

#### Gusar, Vujević 2012

K. Gusar, D. Vujević, Duševića glavica, u: Tumili Krneze i Podvršja kod Zadra, (ed. B. Marijanović), Zadar, 2012, 103-135.

#### Guštin 1975

M. Guštin, Kronologija notranjske skupine, Arheološki vestnik 24, Ljubljana, 1973-1975, 461-506.

#### Guštin 1979

M. Guštin, Notranjska. K začetkom železne dobe na Severnem Jadranu, Katalozi in Monografije 17, Ljubljana, 1979.

#### Hansen 1994

S. Hansen, Studien zu den Metaldeponierungen während der älteren Urnenfelderzeit zwischen Rhonetal und Karpatbecken, Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie 21, Bonn, 1994.

#### Harding 1984

A. Harding, The Mycenaean and Europe, London, 1984.

#### Harding 1995

A. Harding, Die Schwerter im ehemaligen Jugoslawien, Prähistorische Bronzefunde IV/14, Stuttgart, 1995.

#### Harding 2000

A. Harding, European Societies in the Bronze Age, Cambridge, 2000.

#### Harding 2005

A. Harding, The Bronze Age use of caves, u: The Bronze Age in Europe and the Mediterranean, (ed. R. Laffineur, J. Driessen, E. Warmenbol), BAR International Series 1337, Oxford, 2005, 1-4.

#### Harding 2007

A. Harding, Interconnections between the Aegean and Continental Europe in the Bronze and Early Iron Ages: Moving beyond Scepticism, u: Between the Aegean and Baltic Seas: Prehistory across the borders. Proceedings of the International Conference: Bronze and Early Iron Age Interconnections and Contemporary Developments between the Aegean and the Regions of the Balkan Peninsula, Central and Northern Europe. University of Zagreb April, 2005, (ed. I. Galanaki, H. Tomas, Y. Galanakis, R. Laffineur), Aegaeum 27, Liège, 2007, 47-56.

#### Harding 2013

A. Harding, World Systems, Cores, and Peripheries in Prehistoric Europe, European Journal of Archaeology 16,3, Cambridge, 2013, 1-23.

#### Harding, Hughes-Brock 1974

A. Harding, H. Hughes-Brock, Amber in the Mycenaean World, Annual of the British School of Archaeology at Athens 69, Athens, 1974, 145-172.

#### Hase 1995

F.-W. von Hase, Ägäische, griechische und vorderorientalische Einflüsse auf das tyrrhenische Mittelitalien, u: Beiträge zur Urnenfelderzeit nördlich und südlich der Alpen, Ergebnisse eines Kolloquiums, (ed. M. zu Erbach), Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseum 35, Bonn, 1995. 239-286.

#### Hänsel 1997

B. Hänsel, Gaben an die Götter-Schätze der Bronzezeit Europas, u: Gaben an die Götter: Schätze der Bronzezeit Europas, (ed. A. und B. Hänsel), Berlin, 1997, 11-22.

#### Hänsel, Mihovilić, Teržan 1999

B. Hänsel, K. Mihovilić, B. Teržan, Monkodonja-utvrđeno protourbano naselje starijeg i srednjeg brončanog doba kod Rovinja u Istri, Histria Archaeologica 28, Pula, 1999, 37-108.

#### Herzfield 1992

M. Herzfield, Metapatterns, u: Representations in archaeology, (ed. J.-C. Gardin, C. S. Peebles), Bloomington, 1992, 66-86.

#### Hesiod

Hesiod, Theogony and Works and Days-A new translation by M. L. West, Oxford, 2008.

#### Hiller 1991

G. Hiller, Zur japodischen und liburnischen Früheisenzeit Nordwestjugoslawiens, Teil 1, 2. Phil. Diss. Heidelberg, 1991.

#### Hochuli 1998

S. Hochuli, Bernstein/L'ambre, u: Bronzezeit = Age du Bronze=Eta del Bronzo. Die Schweiz vom Paläolithikum bis zum frühen Mittelalter 3, Basel, 1998, 293-295.

#### J. Horvat 2002

J. Horvat, The Hoard of Roman Republican Weapons from Grad near Šmihel, Arheološki vestnik 53, Ljubljana, 2002, 117-192.

#### Horvat 2002

M. Horvat, Rezultati raziskav arheoloških izkopavanj na območju Turjaške palače, u: Preobrazbe Trujaške Palače, Ljubljana, 2002, 53-89.

#### Hughes-Brock 1993

H. Hughes-Brock, Amber in the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age: some problems and perspectives, u: Amber in Archaeology, Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Amber in Archaeology. Liblice 1990, (ed. C. W. Beck, J. Bouzek), Praha, 1993, 219-229.

#### Imamović 1972

E. Imamović, Pseudo Skimnova vijest o dobivanju kositra na Kvarnerskim otocima, Jadranski Zbornik 3, Rijeka-Pula, 1972, 353-357.

#### Imamović 1979

E. Imamović, Povijesno arheološki vodič po Osoru, Sarajevo, 1979.

#### Jung 2006

R. Jung, XPONOΛΟΓΙΑ comparata: Vergleichende Chronologie von Südgriechenland und Süditalien von ca. 1700/1600 bis 1000 v. u. Z. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften 348, Wien, 2006.

#### Jung 2009

R. Jung, I "bronzi internazionali" ed il loro contesto sociale fra Adriatico, Penisola balcanica e coste levantine, u: Dall'Egeo all'Adriatico: organizzazioni sociali, modi di scambio e interazione in eta postpalaziale (XII-XI sec. a.C.), Atti del Seminario internazionale (Udine, 1-2. 12. 2006), (ed. E. Borgna, P. Cássola Guida), Studi di ricerche di protostoria Mediterranea 8, Roma, 2009, 129-157.

**Jung, Mehofer 2006**

R. Jung, M. Mehofer, A sword of Naue II type from Ugarit and the Historical Significance of Italian type Weaponry in the Eastern Mediterranean, *Aegean Archaeology* 8, Warsaw, 2006, 111-136.

**Jung, Mehofer, Pernicka 2011**

R. Jung, M. Mehofer, E. Pernicka, Metal Exchange in Italy from the Middle to the Final Bronze Age (14th – 11th cent. BCE), u: *Metallurgy: Understanding How, Learning Why, Studies in Honor of James D. Muhly*, (ed. P. P. Betancourt, S. C. Ferrence), *Prehistory Monographs* 29, Philadelphia, 2011, 231-248.

**Kaerner 1989**

J. Kaerner, Chronologische probleme der Rušegruppe der Südostalpinen Urnenfelderkultur, *Arheološki vestnik* 39-40, Ljubljana, 1988-1989, 217-234.

**Kaiser 2013**

A. M. Kaiser, Copper oxhide ingot marks: A database and comparative analysis, Master Thesis, Cornell University, New York, 2013.

**Karageorghis 2002**

V. Karageorghis, *Cipro: Crocevia del Mediterraneo orientale 1600-500 a. C.*, Milano, 2002.

**Karavanić 2009**

S. Karavanić, *The Urnfield Culture in Continental Croatia*, BAR International Series 2036, Oxford, 2009.

**Karl, Modl, Porod 2009**

S. Karl, D. Modl, B. Porod, *Archäologische und numismatische Beiträge aus dem Landesmuseum Joanneum, Katalog, Schild von Steier* 22, Graz, 2009.

**Kašuba 2008**

M. Kašuba, Die ältesten Fibeln im Nordpontos: Versuch einer Typologie der einfachen Violonbogenfibeln im südlichen Mittel-, Süd- und Südosteuropa, *Eurasia antiqua*, Mainz, 2008, 14, 193-231.

**Kienlin 2005**

T. L. Kienlin, Die Dinge als Zeichen: Zur Einführung in das Thema, u: *Die Dinge als Zeichen: Kulturelles Wissen und materielle Kultur*, Internationale Fachtagung an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main 3.–5. April 2003, (ed. T. L. Kienlin), *Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie* 127, Bonn, 2005, 1-20.

**Kilian 1971**

K. Kilian, Bemerkungen zur Chronologie der frühen Eisenzeit und zum Beginn der Hallstattzeit in Italien und N/W Jugoslawien, u: *Actes du VIII<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des sciences préhistoriques et protohistoriques* 1, Beograd, 1971, 219-231.

**Kilian 1973**

K. Kilian, Zum italischen und griechischen Fibelhandwerk des 8. und 7. Jahrhunderts, *Hamburger Beiträge zur Archäologie* III,1, Hamburg, 1973, 1-39.

**Kilian 1975**

K. Kilian, Trachtzubehör der Eisenzeit zwischen Ägäis und Adria, *Prähistorische Zeitschrift* 50, Berlin, 1975, 11-140.

**Kilian 1985**

K. Kilian, Magna Grecia, Epiro e Macedonia durante l'età del Ferro. Magna Grecia Epiro e Macedonia, *Atti del venticinquesimo Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia*, Taranto 1984, Taranto, 1985, 237-288.

**Kilian-Dirlmeier 1993**

I. Kilian-Dirlmeier, *Die Schwerter in Griechenland (außerhalb der Peloponnes), Bulgarien und Albanien, Prähistorische Bronzefunde* IV/12, Stuttgart, 1993.

**Kilian-Dirlmeier 2002**

I. Kilian-Dirlmeier, *Kleinfunde aus dem Athena Itonia-Heiligtum bei Philia (Thessalien)*, *Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums* 48, Mainz, 2002.

**Klodič 1885**

A. R. Klodič, *Die Ausgrabungen auf Osseero*, *Mitteilungen der KK-Central Commission* XI, Wien, 1885, I-VII.

**Knapp 1993**

B. Knapp, *Thalassocracies in Bronze Age eastern Mediterranean trade: making and breaking a myth*, *World Archaeology* 24,3, London, 1993, 332-347.

**Knappett 2012**

C. Knappett, *Meaning in Miniature: semiotic networks in material culture*, u: *Excavating the mind*, (ed. M. Jessen, N. Johannsen, H. Juel Jensen), Aarhus, 2012, 87-109.

**Knez 1984**

T. Knez, *Žarno grobišče v Novem mestu. Začasno poročilo o raziskovanju v letu 1982*, *Arheološki vestnik* XXXV, Ljubljana, 1984, 119-133.

**Koka 1990**

A. Koka, *Tuma nr. 6 e varrezës së Shtojit*, *Ilira* 1, Tiranë, 1990, 27-73.

**Komšo, Blečić 2007**

D. Komšo, M. Blečić, *The Secret Cave City Hidden in the Cliffs. Lovranska Draga Canyon, Istria, Croatia*, u: *On Shelter's Ledge: Histories, Theories and Methods of Rockshelter Research*, (ed. M. Kornfeld, S. Vasil'ev, L. Miotti), *BAR International Series* 1655, Oxford, 2007, 119-123.

**Korošec 1989**

P. Korošec, *Bronastodobni elementi iz Jame pod Jamskim gradom v Predjami*, *Arheološki vestnik* 39-40, Ljubljana, 1988-1989, 333-344.

**Kos 2005**

V. Kos, *Gradina Kunci: Prilozi poznavanju gradinskih naselja Istre*, *Histria Archaeologica* 36, Pula, 2005, 47-60.

**Koui, Papandreopoulos, Andreopoulou-Mangou, Papazoglou-Manioudaki, Priftaj-Veveck, Stamati 2006**

M. Kouli, P. Papandreopoulos, E. Andreopoulou-Mangou, L. Papazoglou-Manioudaki, A. Priftaj-Veveck, F. Stamati, *Study of Bronze Age copper-based swords of type Naue II and speargheds from Greece and Albania*, *Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry* 6,1, Rhodes, 2006, 49-59.

**König 2004a**

P. König, *Zur Rekonstruktion des Rahmengerhanges aus dem Hortfund von Veliki Mošunj (Mittelbosnien)*, *Godišnjak* XXXIII-31, Sarajevo, 2004, 127-137.

**König 2004b**

P. König, *Spätbronzezeitliche Hortfunde aus Bosnien und der Herzegowina*, *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* XX/11, Stuttgart, 2004.

**Križ 1995**

B. Križ, *Novo mesto pred Iliri*, *Novo mesto*, 1995.

**Križ, Stipančić, 2007**

B. Križ, P. Stipančić, *Gorjanci – Gorenji Suhadol*, *Varstvo spomenikov* 43, Ljubljana, 2007, 61-62.

**Krnčević, Menđušić, Pedišić 2000**

Ž. Krnčević, M. Menđušić, I. Pedišić, *Danilo*. *Arheološki vodič*, Šibenik, 2000.

**Kružić 2013**

T. Kružić, *Antropološka analiza kremiranih kostiju iz žarnog groba kod sela Dolac-Kotor (tumul na Stolniču)*, *Izveštaj PPMHP Rijeka*, Rijeka, 2013.

#### **Kukoč 1995**

S. Kukoč, Antropomorfní privjesak tipa Prozor, Diadora 16-17, Zadar, 1994-1995, 51-80.

#### **Kukoč 2009a**

S. Kukoč, Japodi-fragmenta symbolica, Split, 2009.

#### **Kukoč 2009b**

S. Kukoč, Nadin – liburnski kult mrtvih; istraživanja 2004.-2006., 2009. god., Asseria 7, Zadar, 2009, 11-80.

#### **Kukoč 2010**

S. Kukoč, Osvrt na spaljivanje pokojnika u liburnskom kulturnom kontekstu, Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu 27, Zagreb, 2010, 95-110.

#### **Kukoč 2011**

S. Kukoč, Obred spaljivanja pokojnika u prapovijesti sjeverne Dalmacije, Archaeologia Adriatica III, Zadar, 2011, 51-82.

#### **Kurti 1976**

D. Kurti, Nouveaux elements sur la civilisation Illyrienne des tumuli de Mati, Iliria 4, Tiranë, 1976, 237-248.

#### **Kurti 1978**

D. Kurti, Tumat e Burrelit, Iliria 7-8, Tiranë, 1977-1978, 157-187.

#### **Leonelli 2003**

V. Leonelli, La necropoli della prima età del ferro delle acciaierie a Terni: contributi per un'edizione critica, Grandi contesti e problemi della Protostoria italiana 7, Firenze, 2003.

#### **Lochner 1991**

M. Lochner, Studien zur Urnenfelderkultur im Waldviertel (Niederösterreich), Mitteilungen der Prähistorischen Kommission 25, Wien, 1991.

#### **Lollini 1976**

D. Lollini, La civiltà Picena. Popoli e civiltà dell'Italia antica V, Roma, 1976, 107-195.

#### **Lonza 1981**

B. Lonza, Ceramica di Eleri, Quaderni Societa di Preistoria e Protostoria Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia 4, Trieste, 1981.

#### **Lo Schiavo 1970**

F. Lo Schiavo, Il gruppo liburnico-japodico, per una definizione nell'ambito della protostoria balcanica, Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, ser. VIII, 14, Roma, 1970, 363-524.

#### **Lo Schiavo 1984**

F. Lo Schiavo, La Daunia e l'Adriatico, u: La civiltà dei Dauni nel quadro del mondo italico, (ed. A. Neppi Modona), Atti del XIII Convegno di Studi Etruschi e Italici, Manfredonia, 21.-27. 07. 1980, Firenze, 1984, 213-247.

#### **Lo Schiavo 2010**

F. Lo Schiavo, Le Fibule dell'Italia meridionale e della Sicilia dall'età del bronzo recente al VI secolo a. C., Prähistorische Bronzefunde XIV, 14, Stuttgart, 2010.

#### **Lo Schiavo, Muhly, Maddin, Giumlia-Mair 2009**

F. Lo Schiavo, J. Muhly, R. Maddin, A. Giumlia-Mair, (ed.), Oxhide ingots in the Central Mediterranean, Biblioteca di Antichità Ciptote 8, Roma, 2009.

#### **Ložnjak Dizdar 2009**

D. Ložnjak Dizdar, Grobovi uglednica kulture polja sa žarama u sjevernoj Hrvatskoj: Prilog poznavanju ženske nošnje kasnog brončanog doba na prostoru južne Panonije, Vjesnik arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu XLII, Zagreb, 2009, 157-182.

#### **Lucentini2002**

N. Lucentini, I Piceni di Colle Vaccaro, u: Il Museo Archeologico Statale di Ascoli Piceno, (ed. N. Lucentini), Pescara, 2002, 46-57.

#### **Lucentini 2007**

N. Lucentini, Riflessi della circolazione Adriatica nelle Marche centromeriodionali, u: Piceni ed Europa, Atti del convegno, (ed. M. Guštin, P. Ettl, M. Buora), Archeologia di frontiera 6, Udine, 2007, 95-108.

#### **Ludajić 2005**

N. Ludajić, Metalurška radionica sa Velike gradine u Varvari, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu 46, Sarajevo, 2005, 59-77.

#### **Ludajić 2011**

N. Ludajić, Dejanovića humke kod Bosanske Gradiške, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu 52, Sarajevo, 2011, 141-166.

#### **Ljubić 1876**

Š. Ljubić, Bakrena doba (Bronzezeit), Viestnik hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva II, Zagreb, 1876, 10-49.

#### **Ljubić 1881**

Š. Ljubić, Prva otkrića iz kamenite dobe u Dalmaciji, Viestnik hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva III, Zagreb, 1881, 1-11.

#### **Ljubić 1889**

Š. Ljubić, Popis arheološkoga odjela Narodnog Zemaljskog Muzeja u Zagrebu, Odsjek I-Svezak I (Predhistorička sbirka), Zagreb, 1889.

#### **Ljubović 2000**

B. Ljubović, Senj u prapovijesti, antici i ranom srednjem vijeku, Senj, 2000.

#### **Mader 2004**

B. Mader, Die Forschungen der Prähistorischen Kommission auf der Insel Krk (Veglia) von 1895 und 1912. – I: 1895 Eduard Nowotny's Grabungen in Val di Sus (Sus) und Castellieri – Untersuchungen im Süden von Punat (Ponte), Ann. Naturhistorisches Museum Wien – Anthropologie und Prähistorie 106, Wien, 2004, 433-447.

#### **Mader 2005**

B. Mader, I castellieri dell' isola di Veglia: sulle orme di Carlo Marchesetti ed Eduard Nowotny, u: Carlo Marchesetti e i castellieri, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Duino (Trieste) 14-15 novembre 2003, (ed. G. Bandelli, E. Montagnari Kokelj), Trieste, 2005, 429-439.

#### **Mader 2006**

B. Mader, Die Forschungen der Prähistorischen Kommission auf der Insel Krk (Veglia) von 1895 und 1912. – II. Die Untersuchungen eisenzeitlicher Gräber durch Josef Szombathy und Michael Abramić in Basca nuova (Baška) – Flur Sveti Kristofor 1912 und Eduard Nowotny in Bescavalle (Draga Baščanska) 1895. Ann. Naturhistorisches Museum Wien – Anthropologie und Prähistorie 107, Wien, 2006, 239-266.

#### **Majnarić-Pandžić 1998**

N. Majnarić-Pandžić, Brončano i željezno doba, u: S. Dimitrijević, T. Težak-Gregl, N. Majnarić-Pandžić, Prapovijest. Povijest umjetnosti u Hrvatskoj, knjiga 1, Zagreb, 1998, 159-358.

#### **Majnarić-Pandžić 2002**

N. Majnarić-Pandžić, C.F.E. Pare, Beiträge zum Übergang von der Bronze-zur Eisenzeit in Mitteleuropa, Teil I - Grundzüge der Chronologie im östlichen Mitteleuropa (11. - 8. Jahrhundert v. Chr.), Jahrbuch RGZM 45/1, Mainz 1998, 293-433 (prikaz), Opvscvla Archaeologica 26, Zagreb, 2002, 341-348.

### **Majnarić-Pandžić 2003**

N. Majnarić-Pandžić, The Burial Rite of the Bronze and the Iron Age in Croatia, u: Burial Customs in the Bronze and Iron Age. Symposium Čačak 4-8. 09. 2002., (ed. N. Bojović, M. Vasić), Čačak, 2003, 41-60.

### **Malinar 1998**

M. Malinar, Brončanodobni lokalitet špilja Bezdanjača – Novi materijal i interpretacija, *Opvsula Archaeologica* 22, Zagreb, 1998, 141-162.

### **Mangani 2003**

E. Mangani, I materiali Piceni conservati nel Museo nazionale Preistorico Etnografico «Luigi Pigorini», u: I Piceni e l'Italia Medio-Adriatica, Atti del XXII Convegno di studi Etruschi ed Italici, Ascoli Piceno-Termo-Ancona 2000, Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, Pisa – Roma, 2003, 291-312.

### **Marchesetti 1903**

C. Marchesetti, I castellieri preistorici di Trieste e della regione Giulia, Trieste, 1903.

### **Marchesetti 1924**

C. Marchesetti, Isole del Quarnero. Regione X. Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità, Fasc. 4-5-6, Roma, 1924, 121-148.

### **Marić 1964**

Z. Marić, Donja dolina, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarejvu XIX, Sarajevo, 1964, 5-128.

### **Marić 1968**

Z. Marić, Japodske nekropole u dolini Une, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarejvu XXIII, Sarajevo, 1968, 5-80.

### **Marijan 2001**

B. Marijan, Željezno doba na južnojadranskom području (istočna Hercegovina, južna Dalmacija), *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 93, Split, 2000-2001, 7-221.

### **Marijanović 2012**

B. Marijanović, Jokina glavica – prapovijesni grobovi, u: Tumili Krneze i Podvršja kod Zadra, (ed. B. Marijanović), Zadar, 2012, 15-47.

### **Marjanović 1981**

M. Marjanović, Kastav, Zbornik Kastavštine 2, Kastav, 1981, 27-54. (Pretisak iz Velikog Ćirilo-Methodskog kalendara za 1908. Zagreb 1908: 5-23.)

### **Marković 1966**

Č. Marković, Ilirska humka u Gotovuši, *Starine Crne Gore III-IV*, Cetinje, 1965-1966, 215-229.

### **Marković 1997**

Č. Marković, Humke u Lisjevom polju, u: *ANTIΔQPON* Dragoslav Srejić completis LXV annis ab amicis collegis discipulis oblatum, (ed. M. Lazić), Univerzitet u Beogradu, Centar za arheološka istraživanja 17, Beograd, 1997, 323-337.

### **Marović 1962**

I. Marović, Nekoliko nalaza iz halštatskog perioda u Dalmaciji, *Vjesnik za historiju i arheologiju dalmatinsku*, LXIII-LXIV, Split, 1961-1962: 5-24.

### **Marović 1967**

I. Marović, Prahistorijski nalazi na području Solina, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju Dalmatinsku* 62, Split, 1967, 5-29.

### **Marović 1969**

I. Marović, Nekoliko nalaza iz halštatskog perioda u Dalmaciji, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju Dalmatinsku* 63-64, Split, 1969, 5-24.

### **Marzatico 2002**

F. Marzatico, Rapporti tra Trentino e Veronese durante la tarda Età del Bronzo e l'Età del Ferro, u: Preistoria Veronese. Contributi e aggiornamenti, (ed. A. Aspes), Memorie del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Verona II,5, Verona, 2002, 192-198.

### **Matejčić 1965**

R. Matejčić, Na Krku otkrivena prehistorijska gradina, *Novi list* 4-5. 12. 1965., Rijeka, 1965.

### **Matejčić 1966**

R. Matejčić, Nalaz halštatskog nakita iz Šula, *Jadranski zbornik* VI, Rijeka-Pula, 1966, 331-340.

### **Matejčić 1968**

R. Matejčić, Zaštitna iskapanja liburnske nekropole na Gromačici kod Lopara na otoku Rabu, *Diadora* 4, Zadar, 1968, 75-83.

### **Matejčić 1983**

R. Matejčić, Sistem prehistorijskih gradina od Rijeke do Staroda, *Liburnijske teme* 5, Opatija, 1983, 47-52.

### **Matejčić 1988**

R. Matejčić, Kako čitati grad, *Rijeka jučer, danas*, Rijeka, 1988.

### **Matošević, Mihovilić 2004**

D. Matošević, K. Mihovilić, Prapovijesni nalazi na Trgu G. Matteottija u Rovinju, *Rovinj*, 2004.

### **Mauss 1996**

M. Mauss, Esey o daru in drugi spisi. Claude Levi-Strauss: Uvod v delo Marcela Maussa. *Studia humanitatis* IX, Ljubljana, 1996.

### **Mayer 1977**

E. F. Mayer, Die Äxte und Beile in Österreich, *Prähistorische Bronzefunde* IX/9, München, 1979.

### **Mendušić, Pedišić, Krnčević 1993**

M. Mendušić, I. Pedišić, Ž. Krnčević, Nakit na šibenskom području od prapovijesti do srednjeg vijeka, Šibenik, 1993.

### **Merhart 1942**

G. von Merhart, Donauländische Beziehungen der früheisenzeitlichen Kulturen Mittelitaliens. Festschrift zum 100 jährigen bestehen der Zeitschrift, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 147, Bonn, 1942, 1-90.

### **Metzner-Nebelsick 2002**

C. Metzner-Nebelsick, Der »Thrako-Kimmerische« Formenkreis aus der Sicht der Urnenfelder- und Hallstattzeit im südöstlichen Pannonien, *Vorgeschichtliche Forschungen* 23, Rahden/Westfalen, 2002.

### **Metzner-Nebelsick 2005**

C. Metzner-Nebelsick, Das bronzezeitliche Gräberfeld von Hordeevka am Südlichen Bug im Spannungsfeld seiner auswärtigen Bezüge, u: Interpretationsraum Bronzezeit. B. Hänsel von seinen Schülern gewidmet, (ed. B. Horjes, R. Jung, E. Keiser, B. Teržan), *Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie* 121, Bonn, 2005, 293-315.

### **Miari 2007**

M. Miari, Monte Battaglia a Casola Valsenio-Katalog, u: Ambre. trasparenze dall'antico. Catalogo della mostra Napoli, 26 marzo-10 settembre 2007, (ed. M. L. Nava, A. Salerno), Napoli, 2007, 80-81.

### **Miari, Pozzi, Prati 2010**

M. Miari, A. Pozzi, L. Prati, Forlì al crocevia della preistoria di Romagna, *Deplijan izložbe*, Forlì, 2010.



#### Mihaljević 1998

D. Mihaljević, Reljef strukturnog podrijetla i strukturno-geomorfološke regije Istre i Kvarnera, Prirodoslovna istraživanja riječkog područja, Prirodoslovna biblioteka 1, Rijeka, 1998, 277-302.

#### Mihelić 2011

S. Mihelić, Zagreb, u: Starija faza kulture polja sa žarama u sjevernoj Hrvatskoj – novi izazovi (ed. M. Dizdar, D. Ložnjak Dizdar, S. Mihelić), Katalog izložbe, Osijek – Zagreb, 2011, 124-131.

#### Mihovilić 1972

K. Mihovilić, Nekropola gradine iznad Limskog kanala, Histria Archaeologica III, 2, Pula, 1972.

#### Mihovilić 1987

K. Mihovilić, Poreština u kontekstu željeznog doba Istre i susjednih kulturnih skupina, Zbornik poreštine 2, Poreč, 1987, 41-49.

#### Mihovilić 1996

K. Mihovilić, Nezakcij, nalaz grobnice 1981. godine, Monografije i katalozi 6, Pula, 1996.

#### Mihovilić 1997

K. Mihovilić, Fortifikacija gradine Gradac-Turan iznad Koromačna, Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva 18, Zagreb, 1997, 39-59.

#### Mihovilić 2001a

K. Mihovilić, Nezakcij, Prapovijesni nalazi 1900.-1953., Monografije i katalozi 11, Pula, 2001.

#### Mihovilić 2001b

K. Mihovilić, Kratki mač – bodež s trokutastom pločom za nasad ručke iz Istre, Arheološki vestnik 52, Ljubljana, 2001, 173-179.

#### Mihovilić 2008

K. Mihovilić, Nekropola u jami Laganiši, u: Pećina Laganiši, mjesto života i smrti (ed. D. Komšo), Katalog izložbe, Pula, 2008, 45-55.

#### Mihovilić 2012

K. Mihovilić, Bronzo finale in Istria, u: Le origini degli Etruschi. Storia Archeologia Antropologia, (ed. V. Bellelli), Roma, 2012, 411-431.

#### Mihovilić 2013

K. Mihovilić, Istri u Istri, Monografije i katalozi 23, Pula, 2013.

#### Mihovilić, Teržan, Hänsel, Matošević, Becker 2002

K. Mihovilić, B. Teržan, B. Hänsel, D. Matošević, C. Becker, Rovinj prije Rima/Rovigno prima die Romani/Rovinj vor den Römern, Kiel, 2002.

#### Miklik-Lozok 2009

L. Miklik-Lozok, Ostave kasno brončanog doba iz Poljanaca, Muzej Brodskog Posavlja, Slavonski Brod, 2009.

#### Milčetić 1884

I. Milčetić, Arheologično-istorične crtice s hrvatskih otoka III. B. Otok Cres. Beli. Osor. Stivan. Martinsćica, Viestnik hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva VI, Zagreb, 1884, 80-85.

#### Mirosavljević 1974

V. Mirosavljević, Gradine i gradinski sistemi u prethistorijsko i protohistorijsko doba, Arheološki radovi i rasprave 7, Zagreb, 1974, 259-297.

#### Mizzan 1994

S. Mizzan, Due corredi della necropoli di Brežec recentemente ritrovati, Atti Civici Musei Storia ed Arte 16, Trieste, (1988) 1994, 105-114.

#### Mladin 1960

J. Mladin, Iskapanje ilirskog tumula u Osoru na otoku Cresu, Jadranski Zbornik 4, Rijeka-Pula, 1960, 211-240.

#### Mladin 1980

J. Mladin, Sitna prapovijesna plastika u Arheološkom muzeju Istre u Puli, Diadora 9, Zadar, 1980, 165-195.

#### Mohorovičić 1953

A. Mohorovičić, Pregled i analiza novootkrivenih objekata historijske arhitekture na području grada Osora, Bulletin Zavoda za likovne umjetnosti JAZU 1-2, Zagreb, 1953, 10-16.

#### Mohorovičić 1956

A. Mohorovičić, Apsyrtydes – Apsorus, Bulletin Zavoda za likovne umjetnosti JAZU 9-10, Zagreb, 1956, 4-11.

#### Mohorovičić 1964

A. Mohorovičić, Nalazi mozaika s ornamentalnim figuralnim motivima u gradu Krku, Bulletin Zavoda za likovne umjetnosti JAZU 12, Zagreb, 1964, 1-8.

#### Montagnari Kokelj 1997

E. Montagnari Kokelj, La necropoli di S. Barbara (Elleri), u: Il Civico Museo Archeologico di Muggia, (ed. F. Maselli Scotti), Trieste, 1997, 145-151.

#### Montanaro 2010

A. C. Montanaro, La tomba 231 di Salapia (Cerignola-Fg). Appunti e riconsiderazioni, Archeologia Classica LX, Roma, 2010, 1-27.

#### Moretti 1983

M. Moretti, Necropoli del castelliere mediano di Pizzugghi, u: Preistoria del Caput Adriae, (ed. C. Russo, A. Boiardi), Udine-Treiste, 1983, 153-158.

#### Mozsolics 2000

A. Mozsolics, Bronzefunde aus Ungarn. Depotfundhorizonte Hajdúböszörmény, Románd und Bükkszentlászló, Prähistorische Archäologie in Südosteuropa 17, Kiel, 2000.

#### Muhly 1998

J. Muhly, Cooper, tin, silver and iron: The search for metallic ores as an incentive for foreign expansion, u: Mediterranean Peoples in Transition. Thirteenth to Early Tenth Centuries BCE. In Honor of Professor Trude Dotham, (ed. S. Gitin, A. Mazar, E. Stern), Jerusalem, 1998, 314-329.

#### Muhly 2006

J. Muhly, Chrysokamino in the History of Early Metallurgy, Hesperia Supplements 36, Princeton, 2006, 155-177.

#### Mulabdić 2011

E. Mulabdić, Mekota u Gornjim Rakanima, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu 52, Sarajevo, 2011, 81-91.

#### Müller-Karpe 1952

H. Müller-Karpe, Das Urnenfeld von Kelheim, Materialhefte zur bayerischen Vorgeschichte 1, Kallmünz, 1952.

#### Müller-Karpe 1959

H. Müller-Karpe, Beiträge zur Chronologie der Urnenfelderzeit nördlich und südlich der Alpen, Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 22, Berlin, 1959.

#### Müller-Karpe 1961

H. Müller-Karpe, Die Vollgriffschwerter der Urnenfelderzeit aus Bayern, Münchner Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte 6, München, 1961.

#### Müller-Karpe 1974

H. Müller-Karpe, Zur Definition und Benennung chronologischer Stufen der Kupferzeit, Bronzezeit und älteren Eisenzeit, Jahresbericht des Instituts für Vorgeschichte der Universität Frankfurt am Main, Frankfurt am Main, 1974, 7-18.

#### **Müllner 1896**

A. Müllner, Prähistorische Forschung auf dem Fiumaner Gebiet, Sažeci predavanja od 7. 11. 1895. Mittheilungen des Naturwissenschaftlichen Clubs in Fiume, Fiume, 1896, 71-72.

#### **Müllner 1897**

A. Müllner, Najstariji kulturni i trgovački odnosi ovoga kraja i metode istraživanja prahistorije, Sažeci predavanja od 3. 1. 1896. Mittheilungen des Naturwissenschaftlichen Clubs in Fiume, Fiume, 1897.

#### **Nadbath 2004**

B. Nadbath, Metallene Einzelfunde der Bronze- und Eisenzeit im Raum von Bosnien und Herzegowina, Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja 33 (31), Sarajevo, 2004, 33-125.

#### **Nascimbene 2009**

A. Nascimbene, Le Alpi Orientali nell'Età del Ferro (VII-V secolo a. C.), Collana L'Album 15, Udine, 2009.

#### **Naso 2003**

A. Naso, I bronzi etruschi e italici del Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Kataloge vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Altertümer 33, Mainz, 2003.

#### **Nebelsick 1997**

L. Nebelsick, Auf Biegen und Brechen. Ekstatische Elemente bronzezeitlicher Materialopfer – Ein Deutungsversuch, u: Gaben an die Götter: Schätze der Bronzezeit Europas, (ed. A. und B. Hänsel), Berlin, 1997, 35-41.

#### **Nebelsick 2000**

L. Nebelsick, Rent asunder: Ritual violence in Late Bronze Age hoards, u: Metals Make the World Go Round. The Supply and Circulation of Metals in Bronze Age Europe, (ed. C. F. E. Pare), Oxford, 2000, 160-175.

#### **Nebelsick, Kaus 2000**

L. Nebelsick, K. Kaus, Das Kriegergrab von Villach, Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica 32, Berlin, 2000, 122-140.

#### **Negroni Catacchio 1976**

N. Negroni Catacchio, Le vie dell'ambra, i passi alpini orientali e l'Alto Adriatico, u: Aquilea e l'arco alpino orientale, Antichità Altoadriatiche 9, Udine, 1976, 21-57.

#### **Negroni Catacchio 1978**

N. Negroni Catacchio, L'ambra nella protostoria italiana, L' Ambra, oro del Nord, Catalogo della mostra omonima, Venezia, 1978, 83-87.

#### **Negroni Catacchio 1984a**

N. Negroni Catacchio, La problematica dell'ambra nella protostoria italiana: le ambre intagliate di Fratta Polesine e le rotte mercantili nell'Alto Adriatico, Padvs 20, Pisa-Roma 1984, 73-90.

#### **Negroni Catacchio 1984b**

N. Negroni Catacchio, La problematica dell'ambra nella protostoria italiana: ancora sulle ambre di Frattesina di Fratta Polesine, Padvs 20, Pisa-Roma, 1984, 141-153.

#### **Negroni Catacchio 1989**

N. Negroni Catacchio, L'ambra: produzione e commerci nell'Italia pre-romana, u: Italia Omnium terrarum parens, (ed. C. Ampolo), Milano, 1989, 659-696.

#### **Negroni Catacchio 2009**

N. Negroni Catacchio, Amber as Prestige and Social indicator in late Prehistoric Italy, u: Amber in Archaeology. Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Amber in Archaeology, Belgrade 2006, (ed. A. Palavestra, C. W. Beck, J. M. Todd), Beograd, 2009, 190-209.

#### **Negroni Catacchio, Nava, Chiaravalle 1979**

N. Negroni Catacchio, M. L. Nava, M. Chiaravalle, Il Bronzo Finale nell'Italia nord-occidentale, Atti della XXI Riunione Scientifica dell'Istituto Italiano

di Preistoria e Protostoria, in memoria di F. Rittatore Vonwiller, Firenze 1977, Firenze, 1979, 47-112.

#### **Negroni Catacchio, Massari, Raposso 2006**

N. Negroni Catacchio, A. Massari, B. Raposso, L'ambra come indicatore di scambi nell'Italia pre e protostorica, u: Materie prime e scambi nella preistoria italiana, Atti della XXXIX Riunione Scientifica dell'Istituto Italiano di Preistoria e Protostoria 3, Firenze, 2006, 1439-1475.

#### **Nijboer 2005**

A. Nijboer, La cronologia assoluta dell'età del ferro nel Mediterraneo, dibattito sui metodi e sui risultati, u: Oriente e occidente. Metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro italiana. Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma 30-31 ottobre 2003, (ed. G. Bartoloni, F. Delpino), Mediterranea I, Pisa-Roma, 2005, 527-556.

#### **Nijboer 2010**

A. J. Nijboer, Italy, its interconnections and cultural shifts during the Iron Age, u: Atti XVII Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia Classica; Incontri tra Culture nel Mondo Mediterraneo Antico, Roma, Palazzo della FAO, Settembre 22-26, 2008, Bollettino di Archeologia online I (Volume speciale), Roma, 2010, 1-22.

#### **Nijboer, Plicht, Bietti Sestieri, De Santis 2000**

A. J. Nijboer, J. van der Plicht, A. M. Bietti Sestieri, A. de Santis, A high chronology for the Early Iron Age in central Italy, Palaeohistoria 41-42, Groningen, 1999-2000, 163-176.

#### **Nijboer, Plicht 2008**

A. J. Nijboer, J. van der Plicht, The Iron Age in the Mediterranean: recent radiocarbon research at the University of Groningen, u: A New Dawn for the Dark Age? Shifting Paradigms in Mediterranean Iron Age Chronology, (ed. D. Brandhern, M. Trachsel), BAR International Series 1871, Oxford, 2008, 103-118

#### **Nodilo, Vrkić, Skelac, Kulenović 2012**

H. Nodilo, Š. Vrkić, G. Skelac, I. Kulenović, Vojvodine-Migalovci: nekropola s početka kulture polja sa žarama, Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu 29, Zagreb, 2012, 89-124.

#### **Nopcsa 1912**

B. F. Nopcsa, Beiträge zur Vorgeschichte und Ethnologie Nordalbaniens, Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bosnia und der Herzegowina 12, Sarajevo, 1912, 168-253.

#### **Nowotny, Sticotti 1896**

E. Nowotny, P. Sticotti, Aus Liburnien und Istrien, Archäologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn XIX, Wien, 1896, 159-180.

#### **Osborne 2004**

R. Osborne, Hoards, votives, offerings: the archaeology of the dedicated object, World Archaeology 36,1, London, 2004, 1-10.

#### **Pabst-Dörner 2000**

Pabst-Dörner, Untersuchungen zu hallstattzeitlichen Frauentrachten mit Spiralbrillenfibeln zwischen Alpen, Karpaten und Ostsee, Internationale Archäologie 51, Rahden/Westfalen, 2000.

#### **Pabst 2009**

S. Pabst, Bevölkerungsbewegungen auf der Balkanhalbinsel am Beginn der Früheisenzeit und die Frage der ethnogenese der Makedonen, Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 124, Berlin, 2009, 1-73.

#### **Pabst 2012**

S. Pabst, Die Brillenfibeln: Untersuchungen zu spätbronze- und ältereisenzeitlichen Frauentrachten zwischen Ostsee und Mittelmeer, Marburger Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte 25, Rahden/Westfalen, 2012.

#### **Pacciarelli 2000**

M. Pacciarelli, Elites guerriere e traffici mediterranei nel Bronzo finale:

nuovi dati sulle sepolture di Castellace (Oppido Mamertina, RC). u: Il Protovillanoviano al di qua e al di là dell'Appennino, Atti della Giornata di studio, Pavia, 17 giugno 1995, (ed. M. Harari, M. Pearce), Biblioteca di Athenaeum 38, Como, 2000, 175-200.

#### **Pacciarelli 2001**

M. Pacciarelli, Dal villaggio alla città. La svolta protourbana del 1000 a.C. nell'Italia tirrenica, Grandi contesti e problemi della Protostoria Italiana 4, Roma, 2001.

#### **Pacciarelli 2005**

M. Pacciarelli, 14C correlazioni con le dendrodate nord alpine: elementi per una cronologia assoluta del Bronzo finale 3 e del primo Ferro dell'Italia peninsulare, u: Oriente e occidente. Metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro italiana, Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma 30-31 ottobre 2003, (ed. G. Bartoloni, F. Delpino), *Mediterranea I*, Pisa-Roma, 2005, 81-90.

#### **Pahič 1972**

S. Pahič, Pobrežje, Katalozi in Monografije 6, Ljubljana, 1972.

#### **Pahič 1995**

S. Pahič, Prebliski iz pradavnine ob gornji Dravinji, Maribor, 1995.

#### **Pahič 1989**

V. Pahič, Žarno grobišče na Brinjevi gori, *Arheološki vestnik* 39-40, Ljubljana, 1988-1989, 181-216.

#### **Palavestra 1992**

A. Palavestra, Amber beads of the Tiryns type, *Balkanica* 23, Beograd, 1992, 381-391.

#### **Palavestra 1993**

A. Palavestra, Praistorijski čilibar na centralnom i zapadnom Balkanu, *Balkanološki institut Srpske Akademije nauka i umetnosti, Posebna izdanja* 52, Beograd, 1993.

#### **Palavestra 2006**

A. Palavestra, Amber in Archaeology, u: *The magic of Amber* (A. Palavestra, V. Krstić), *Archaeological monographies* 18, Beograd, 2006, 32-85.

#### **Papadopoulos, Bejko, Moriss 2007**

J. K. Papadopoulos, L. Bejko, S. P. Moriss, Excavations at the Prehistoric Burial Tumulus of Lofkënd in Albania: A Preliminary Report for the 2004-2005 Seasons, *American Journal of Archaeology* 111, Boston, Massachusetts, 2007, 105-147.

#### **Pare 1998**

C. F. E. Pare, Beiträge zum Übergang von der Bronze- zur Eisenzeit in Mitteleuropa, Teil 1. Grundzüge der chronologie im östlichen Mitteleuropa (11.-8. Jahrhundert V. Chr.), *Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum* 45,1, Mainz, 1998, 293-433.

#### **Pare 1999**

C. F. E. Pare, Weights and weighing in Bronze Age Central Europe, u: *Eliten in der Bronzezeit. Ergebnisse zweier Kolloquien in Mainz und Athen*, *Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseum* 43,2, Mainz, 1999, 421-514.

#### **Pare 2000**

C. F. E. Pare, (ed.), *Metals Make the World Go Round. The Supply and Circulation of Metals in Bronze Age Europe*, Oxford, 2000.

#### **Pare 2008**

C. F. E. Pare, Italian metalwork of the 11th-9th centuries BC and the absolute chronology of the Dark Age Mediterranean, u: *A New Dawn for the Dark Age? Shifting Paradigms in Mediterranean Iron Age Chronology*, (ed. D. Brandherm, M. Trachsel), *BAR International Series* 1871, Oxford, 2008, 77-101.

#### **Parović-Pešikan 1985**

M. Parović-Pešikan, Neki novi aspekti širenja egejske i grčke kulture na centralni Balkan, *Starinar* XXXVI, Beograd, 1985, 19-49.

#### **Pearce 2000**

M. Pearce, Metals make the world go round: the copper supply for Frattesina, u: *Metals Make the World Go Round. The Supply and Circulation of Metals in Bronze Age Europe*, (ed. C. F. E. Pare), Oxford, 2000, 108-115.

#### **Perkić, Ložnjak Dizdar 2005**

D. Perkić, D. Ložnjak Dizdar, Kasnobrončanodobna ostava Siča/Lučica, *Opscvla Arcaheolgica* 29, Zagreb, 2005, 41-119.

#### **Periša 2003**

D. Periša, B. Marijan, Željezno doba na južnojadranskom području (istočna Hercegovina, južna Dalmacija), Split 2001 (prikaz), *Obavijesti Hrvatskog arheološkog društva* XXXV,2, Zagreb, 2003, 90-103.

#### **Peroni 1973**

R. Peroni, *Studi di cronologia hallstattiana*, Roma, 1973.

#### **Peroni 1976**

R. Peroni, La «Koiné» adriatica e il suo processo di formazione, u: *Jadranska obala u protohistoriji. Kulturni i etnički problemi*, Simpozij održan u Dubrovniku 1972., (ed. B. Čečuk, N. Majnarić-Pandžić, V. Miroslavljević, M. Suić), Zagreb, 1976, 95-115.

#### **Peroni 1983**

R. Peroni, L'età del bronzo, u: *Preistoria del Caput Adriae*, (ed. C. Russo, A. Boiardi), Udine-Treiste, 1983, 75-86.

#### **Peroni 1992**

R. Peroni, Villanoviano e Fermo? u: *La Civiltà Picena nelle Marche*, *Studi di onore di G. Annibaldi. Contributi presentati al Convegno sulla Civiltà Picena nelle Marche*, Ancona 1988, *Ripatransone*, 1992, 13-38.

#### **Peroni 1998**

R. Peroni, *Classificazione tipologica, seriazione cronologica, distribuzione geografica, Aquileia Nostra* LXIX, Udine, 1998, 10-28.

#### **Peroni 2004**

R. Peroni, *Culti, comunità, tribali e gentilizie, caste guerriere e figure di eroi e principi nel secondo millennio in Italia tra Europa centrale ed Egeo*, u: *Guerrieri, Principi ed Eroi fra Danubio e il Po della Preistoria all'Alto Medioevo*, (ed. F. Marzatico, P. Gleirscher), Trento, 2004, 161-173.

#### **Peroni, Carancini, Bergonzi, Lo Schiavo, von Eles 1980**

R. Peroni, G. L. Carancini, G. Bergonzi, F. Lo Schiavo, P. von Eles, *Per una definizione critica di facies locali: nuovi strumenti metodologici*, u: *Il bronzo finale in Italia*, (ed. R. Peroni), Bari, 1980, 9-87.

#### **Peroni, Vanzetti 2005**

R. Peroni, A. Vanzetti, *Intorno alla cronologia della prima età del Ferro italiana*, da H. Müller-Kapre a Chr. Pare, u: *Oriente e occidente. Metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro italiana*, Atti dell'incontro di studio, Roma 30-31 ottobre 2003, (ed. G. Bartoloni, F. Delpino), *Mediterranea I*, Pisa-Roma, 2005, 53-80.

#### **Petris 1895**

S. Petris, *Notiz 153-Ossero*, *Mittheilungen der K. K. Central-Commission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst – und Historischen Denkmale* XXI, Wien, 1895, 258, 270.

#### **Petris 1897**

S. Petris, *Notiz-Ossero 119*, *Mittheilungen der K. K. Central-Commission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst – und Historischen Denkmale* XXIII, Wien, 1897, 176.

#### **Piecznyński 1954**

Z. Piecznyński, *Cmentarzysko z wczesnego okresu żelaznego (700-400 przed n.e.) w Górszewicach, w pow. szamotulskim*, *Fontes archaeologici Posnanienses* IV, Posnan (1953) 1954, 101-152.

**Pincelli, Morigi Govi 1975**

R. Pincelli, C. Morigi Govi, La necropoli villanoviana di San Vitale, Bologna, 1975.

**Polonijo, Bulić 1931**

M. Polonijo, F. Bulić, Starinski nalaz u Krku, Povodom pedesetogodnjice jubileja Vjesnika za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku 1878-1928, Split, 1931, 73-76 + T I, II.

**Pogačnik 2002**

A. Pogačnik, Način pokopa in analiza pridatkov, u: D. Svoljšak, A. Pogačnik, Tolmin, prazgodovinsko grobišče II, Katalogi in Monografije 35, Ljubljana, 2002, 21-84.

**Preucel 2006**

R. W. Preucel, Archaeological Semiotics, Oxford, 2006.

**Primas 2011**

M. Primas, Valuable and Ornaments, Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi 19, Bergamo, 2011, 125-134.

**Puš 1971**

I. Puš, Žarnogrobiščna nekropola na dvorišču SAZU v Ljubljani-lzkopavanja v letih 1964-196, Razprave SAZU VII/1, Ljubljana, 1971.

**Puš 1982**

I. Puš, Prazgodovinsko žarno grobišče v Ljubljani, Razprave SAZU XIII/2, Ljubljana, 1982.

**Raunig 1982**

B. Raunig, Grob ranog željeznog doba iz Ostržca kod Cazina, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu 37, Sarajevo, 1982, 1-14.

**Renfrew, Zubrow 1994**

C. Renfrew, E. B. W. Zubrow (ed), The ancient mind: Elements of cognitive archaeology, Cambridge, 1994.

**Renfrew, Bahn 2004**

C. Renfrew, P. Bahn, Archaeology: Theories, Methods, and Practice, London, 2004.

**Righi 1977**

G. Righi, Scavi 1900: Fondo Snidersich, u: G. Steffè De Piero, S. Vitri, G. Righi, La necropoli di Brežec presso San Canziano del Carso. Scavi Marchesetti 1896-1900, Monografie di Preistoria degli "Atti dei Civici Musei di Storia ed Arte" I, Trieste, 1977, 114-118.

**Righi 1982**

G. Righi, La necropoli "Celtica" di S. Canziano del Carso: Scavi Marchesetti 1903-1904 (?), Trieste, 1982.

**Říhovský 1979**

J. Říhovský, Die Nadeln in Mähren und im Ostalpengebiet, Prähistorische Bronzefunde XIII/5, München, 1979.

**Říhovský 1983**

J. Říhovský, Die Nadeln in Westungarn, Prähistorische Bronzefunde XIII/10, München, 1983.

**Rogić 1975**

V. Rogić, Cresko-lošinjaska otočna skupina, u: J. Riđanović, J. Rogić, V. Rogić, T. Šegota, Geografija SR Hrvatske – Sjeverno hrvatsko primorje, sv. 4, Zagreb, 1975.

**Rogić 1982**

V. Rogić, Regionalna geografija Jugoslavije, Zagreb, 1982.

**Rychner 1995**

V. Rychner, Stand und Aufgaben dendrochronologischer Forschung zur Urnenfelderzeit, u: Beiträge zur Urnenfelderzeit nördlich und

südlich der Alpen, Ergebnisse eines Kolloquiums, (ed. M. zu Erbach), Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseum 35, Mainz, 1995, 455-487.

**Rychner 1998**

V. Rychner, Glas und Fayance, u: Bronzezeit = Age du Bronze=Età del Bronzo. Die Schweiz vom Paläolitikum bis zum frühen Mittelalter 3, Basel, 1998, 291-293.

**Rychner, Böhringer, Gassmann 1996**

V. Rychner, S. Böhringer, P. Gassmann, Dendrochronologie et typologie du Bronze Final dans la région de Neuchâtel (Suisse): Un Résumé, u: Absolute Chronology. Archaeological Europe 2500-500 BC. (ed. K. Randsborg), Acta Archaeologica 67, København, 1996, 307-314.

**Rychner-Faraggi 1993**

A-M. Rychner-Faraggi, Métal et parure au Bronze final, Hauterive-Champréveyres 9, Archéologie neuchâteloise 17, Neuchâtel, 1993.

**Rubat Borel 2009**

F. Rubat Borel, Tipologia e cronologia degli elementi del ripostiglio di Chiusa di Pesio, u: Il ripostiglio del Monte Cavanero di Chiusa di Pesio (Cuneo), (ed. M. Venturino Gambari), Alessandria, 2009, 55-104.

**Sacken 1879**

E. von Sacken, Neuere Erwerbungen der Antikensammlung des A. h. Kaiserhauses: Von Ossero auf der Insel Cherso, Archäologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Österreich III, Wien, 1879, 150.

**Sahlins 1999**

M. Sahlins, Ekonomika kamene dobe, Ljubljana, 1999.

**Sakara Sučević 2004**

M. Sakara Sučević, Kaštelir. Prazgodovinska naselbina pri Novi vasi/Brtonigla (Istra), Annales Mediterranea, Koper, 2004.

**Salzani 1978**

L. Salzani, La necropoli dell'età del Bronzo a Fontanella Mantovana, Preistoria Alpina 14, Trento, 1978, 115-162.

**Salzani 1984**

L. Salzani, Il territorio Veronese durante il I Millennio a.C., u: Il Veneto nell'antichità-Età del Ferro, (ed. L. Salzani), Verona, 1984, 717-808.

**Salzani 1987**

L. Salzani, Un nuovo ripostiglio di bronzi da Frattesina, Padvsia XXIII, Pisa-Roma, 1987, 219-231.

**Salzani 1989**

L. Salzani, Necropoli dell'età del Bronzo Finale alle Narde di Fratta Polesine. Prima nota, Padvsia XXV, Pisa-Roma, 1989, 5-42.

**Salzani 1991**

L. Salzani, Necropoli dell'età del Bronzo finale alle Narde di Fratta Polesine. Seconda nota, Padvsia XXVI-XXVII, Pisa-Roma, 1990-1991, 125-206.

**Salzani 2001**

L. Salzani, Tombe protostoriche dalla necropoli della Colombara (Gazzo Veronese), Padvsia XXXVII, Pisa-Roma, 2001, 83-132.

**Salzani 2002a**

L. Salzani, Depositi votivi, u: Preistoria Veronese. Contributi e aggiornamenti, (ed. A. Aspes), Memorie del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Verona II/5, Verona, 2002, 159-163.

**Salzani 2002b**

L. Salzani, La necropoli di Ponte Nuovo, u: Preistoria Veronese. Contributi e aggiornamenti, (ed. A. Aspes), Memorie del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Verona II/5, Verona, 2002, 164-167.

**Salzani, Consoni 2005**

L. Salzani, A. Consoni, L'abitato protostorico di Villamarzana - Campagna Michela (Ro). Scavi 1993, Padusa, XLI, Pisa-Roma, 7-55.

**Salzani, Colonna 2010**

L. Salzani, C. Colonna (ed.), La fragilità dell'urna. I recenti scavi a Narde. Necropoli di Frattesina (XII-IX sec. a.C.), Rovigo, 2010.

**Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978**

E. Sapouna-Sakellarakis, Die Fibeln der griechischen Inseln, Prähistorische Bronzefunde XIV/4, München, 1978.

**SCE 1934**

The Swedish Cyprus Expedition, Find and results of the excavations in Cyprus 1927-1931, Vol. I. Plates, Stockholm, 1934.

**SCE 1935**

The Swedish Cyprus Expedition, Find and results of the excavations in Cyprus 1927-1931. Vol. II. Plates, Stockholm, 1935.

**Schauer 1971**

P. Schauer, Die Schwerter in Süddeutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz I (Griffplatten- Griffangel- und Griffzungenschwerter), Prähistorische Bronzefunde IV/2, München, 1971.

**Sherratt 1993**

A. Sherratt, What would a Bronze-Age world system look like? Relations between temperate Europe and the Mediterranean in later prehistory, European Journal of Archaeology 1,2, Cambridge, 1993, 1-57.

**Sherratt 2000**

A. Sherratt, Circulation of metals and the end of the Bronze Age in the Eastern Mediterranean, u: Metals Make the World Go Round. The Supply and Circulation of Metals in Bronze Age Europe, (ed. C. F. E. Pare), Oxford, 2000, 82-98.

**Sherratt, Sherratt 1993**

A. Sherratt, S. Sherratt, The growth of the Mediterranean economy in the early first millennium BC, World Archaeology 24,3, London, 1993, 361-377.

**Srejović, Marković 1980**

D. Srejović, Č. Marković, A Find from Lisjevo Polje near Ivangrad (Montenegro). Archeologica Iugoslavica XX-XXI, Beograd, 1980-1981, 70-79.

**Starac 1988**

R. Starac, Podosojna peč, Arheološki pregled, Ljubljana, 1988, 71.

**Starac 1991**

R. Starac, Prilog poznavanju keramike brončanog doba na Kvarneru, Diplomski rad, Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 1991.

**Starac 1994**

R. Starac, Rezultati najnovijih arheoloških istraživanja na području Lovranštine, Mošćeništine i Brseštine, Liburnijske Teme 8, Opatija, 1994, 9-30.

**Starac 1996**

R. Starac, Rezultati najnovijih arheoloških istraživanja na području općine Matulji, Liburnijske Teme 9, Opatija, 1996, 7-16.

**Starac 2000**

R. Starac, Pregled povijesti naseljavanja Učke s gledišta arheološke topografije, u: Učka - živjeti s planinom i od planine, Bilten Općine Lovran, Posebno izdanje uz okrugli stol održanog u Lovranu 24. 04. 1999., (ed. Sandra Kolonić Bistričić), Lovran, 2000, 7-9.

**Starac 2002**

R. Starac, Arheološka baština Jadranova. Izvješće o arheološkim istraživanjima od 1993. do 2000. godine, Vinodolski zbornik 8, Crikvenica 2002, 189-206.

**Starac 2004**

R. Starac, Kulturno-povijesna baština sela Kotor, Vinodolski zbornik 9, Crikvenica, 2004, 165-185.

**Starac 2005**

R. Starac, Solin u Kostreni, gradina kod Praputnjaka i Gornji grad u Bakru – prve spoznaje o početku naseljavanja prema analizi pokretnih arheoloških nalaza, Bakarski zbornik 10, Bakar, 2005, 158-168.

**Starac 2006a**

R. Starac, Rijeka-Sv. Križ, Hrvatski arheološki godišnjak 3, Zagreb, 2006, 308-309.

**Starac 2006b**

R. Starac, Keršovani vrh-Garica, Hrvatski arheološki godišnjak 3, Zagreb, 2006, 294-295.

**Starac 2007**

R. Starac, Kotor-Godač, Hrvatski arheološki godišnjak 4, Zagreb, 2007, 346-348.

**Starè 1951**

F. Starè, Ilirsko grobišče pri Dobovi, Arheološki vestnik 2, Ljubljana, 1951, 61-68.

**Starè 1954**

F. Starè, Ilirske najdbe železne dobe v Ljubljani, Dela SAZU 9/7, Ljubljana, 1954.

**Starè 1957**

F. Starè, Polmesečne britve iz Jugoslavije, Arheološki vestnik 3-4, Ljubljana, 1957, 204-221.

**Starè 1960**

F. Starè, Grob 108 iz Dobove, Situla 1, Ljubljana, 1960, 81-110.

**Starè 1975**

F. Starè, Dobova, Posavski muzej Brežice, knjiga 2, Brežice, 1975.

**Steffè De Piero 1977**

G. Steffè De Piero, Scavi 1899: Fondo Silla, u: G. Steffè De Piero, S. Vitri, G. Righi, La necropoli di Brežec presso San Canziano del Carso. Scavi Marchesetti 1896-1900, Monografie di Preistoria degli "Atti dei Civici Musei di Storia ed Arte" I, Trieste, 1977, 96-113.

**Stipančić 2009**

P. Stipančić, Depojska najdba Gorenji Suhadol, u: B. Križ, P. Stipančić, A. Škedelj Petrič, Arheološka podoba Dolenjske, Katalog stalne arheološke razstave Dolenjskega muzeja Novo mesto, Novo mesto, 2009, 226-230.

**Stockhammer 2004**

P. W. Stockhammer, Zur Chronologie, Verbreitung und Interpretation urnenfelderzeitlicher Vollgriffschwerter, Tübinger Texte 5, Rahden/Westfalen, 2004.

**Stos-Gale 2000**

S. Stos-Gale, Trade in metals in the Bronze Age Mediterranean: an overview of Lead Isotope data for provenance studies, u: Metals Make the World Go Round. The Supply and Circulation of Metals in Bronze Age Europe, (ed. C. F. E. Pare), Oxford, 2000, 56-69.

**Stražičić 1981**

N. Stražičić, Otok Cres: prilog poznavanju geografije naših otoka, Mali Lošinj, 1981.

**Stražičić 1996a**

N. Stražičić, Osnovna geografska obilježja Županije primorsko-goranske, u: Županija primorsko-goranska, Povijesni pregled od najstarijih vremena do današnjih dana, Rijeka, 1996, 37-52.

**Stražičić 1996b**

N. Stražičić, Prilog poznavanju pretpovijesnih gradina u okolici Bakra, Bakarski zbornik 2, Bakar, 1996, 63-92.

**Stražičić 1997**

N. Stražičić, Cresko-lošinjsko otočje – geografska obilježja, Geografski horizont 43, 2, Zagreb, 1997, 63-86

#### **Stražičić 1998**

N. Stražičić, Prapovijesne gradine na području grada Rijeke, Sveti Vid 3, Rijeka, 1998, 11-44.

#### **Strmčnik-Gulič 1989**

M. Strmčnik-Gulič, Bronastodobni naselitveni kompleks v Rabelčji vasi na Ptuju (preliminarno poročilo), Arheološki vestnik 39-40, Ljubljana, 1988-1989, 147-170.

#### **Sveško 1945**

I. Sveško, Historijat Gradskog muzeja Sušak do 5. 1945., Arhiv kulturno-povijesnog odjela PPMHP Rijeka, Rijeka.

#### **Svoljšak, Pogačnik 2001**

D. Svolfjšak, A. Pogačnik, Tolmin, prazgodovinsko grobišče I – Katalog, Katalogi in Monografije 34, Ljubljana, 2001.

#### **Šinkovec 1995**

I. Šinkovec, Katalog posameznih kovinskih najdb bakrene in bronaste dobe, u: Depojske in posamezne kovinske najdbe bakrene in bronaste dobe na Slovenskem I, (ed. B. Teržan), Katalogi in Monografije 29, Ljubljana, 1995, 29-127.

#### **Țârlea 2008**

A. Țârlea, The concept of „selective deposition“, Peuce VI, Tulcea, 2008, 63-132.

#### **Teržan 1984a**

B. Teržan, O jantaru z Derbelega vrha, Arheološki vestnik 35, Ljubljana, 1984, 110-118.

#### **Teržan 1984b**

B. Teržan, Nošnja kao obilježje društvenih skupina između Drima i Devolla u starije željezno doba (Romaja-Burrel-Kuč i Zi), u: Simpozijum Duhovna kultura Ilira, (ed. A. Benac), Posebna izdanja Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja LXVII-11, Sarajevo, 1984, 197-214.

#### **Teržan 1987**

B. Teržan, Obredi in verovanja, u: Bronasta doba na Slovenskem, (ed. B. Gombač), Ljubljana, 1987, 65-78.

#### **Teržan 1989**

B. Teržan, Kolokvij – Bronasta doba v Sloveniji, Lendava, 12.-15. November 1986, Arheološki vestnik 39-40, Ljubljana, 1989, 111-114.

#### **Teržan 1990a**

B. Teržan, Polmesečaste fibule. O kulturnih povezavah med Egejo in Caput Adriae, Arheološki vestnik 41, Ljubljana, 1990, 49-88.

#### **Teržan 1990b**

B. Teržan, Starejša železna doba na slovenskem Štajerskem, Katalogi in Monografije 25, Ljubljana, 1990.

#### **Teržan 1992**

B. Teržan, Beobachtungen zu den ältereisenzeitlichen Bestattungssitten im mittleren und südostalpinen Raum, u: Die Räter/I Reti, (ed. R. Metzger, P. Gleirscher), Bolzano, 1992, 451-474.

#### **Teržan 1995**

B. Teržan, Stand und Aufgaben der Forschungen zur Urnenfelderzeit in Jugoslawien, u: Beiträge zur Urnenfelderzeit nördlich und südlich der Alpen, Ergebnisse eines Kolloquiums, (ed. M. zu Erbach), Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseum 35, Mainz, 1995, 323-372.

#### **Teržan 1996**

B. Teržan, Sklepna beseda, u: Depojske in posamezne kovinske najdbe bakrene in bronaste dobe na Slovenskem II, (ed. B. Teržan), Katalogi in Monografije 30, Ljubljana, 1996, 243-258.

#### **Teržan 1999**

B. Teržan, An Outline of the Urnfield Culture Period in Slovenia, Arheološki vestnik 50, Ljubljana, 1999, 97-143.

#### **Teržan 2000**

B. Teržan, Die Bronzezeit und ältere Eisenzeit im ö. Mitteleuropa, Beziehungen zum Mittelmeergebiet, u: Fibel und Fibeltracht. Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, (ed. H. Beck, H. Steuer, D. Timpe, R. Wenskus), Studienausgabe 34, Berlin, 2000, (444)-46 (456).

#### **Teržan 2002**

B. Teržan, Kronološki oris, u: D. Svolfjšak, A. Pogačnik, Tolmin, prazgodovinsko grobišče II. Katalogi in Monografije 35, Ljubljana, 2002, 85-102.

#### **Teržan 2007**

B. Teržan, Cultural Connections between Caput Adriae and the Aegean in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age, u: Between the Aegean and Baltic Seas: Prehistory across the borders. Proceedings of the International Conference: Bronze and Early Iron Age Interconnections and Contemporary Developments between the Aegean and the Regions of the Balkan Peninsula, Central and Northern Europe, (ed. I. Galanaki, H. Tomas, Y. Galanakis, R. Laffineur), University of Zagreb, April, 2005, Aegaeum 27, Liège, 2007, 157-166.

#### **Teržan 2009**

B. Teržan, Japodska nevesta iz okolice Novega Mesta, Vjesnik arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu XLII, Zagreb, 2009, 213-230.

#### **Teßmann 2001**

B. Teßmann, Schmuck und Trachtzubehör aus Prozor, Kroatien. Ein Beitrag zur Tracht im japodischen Gebiet, Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica 33, Berlin, 2001, 28-151.

#### **Težak-Gregl 1984**

T. Težak-Gregl, Nov prehistorijski nalaz iz Jurjeva, Senjski zbornik 10-11, Senj, 1984, 3-10.

#### **Tine Bertocchi 1975**

F. Tine Bertocchi, Formazione della civiltà daunia dal X al VI secolo a.C., u: Atti Colloquio Internazionale di Preistoria e Protostoria della Daunia, Foggia, 24-29 aprile 1974, Firenze, 1975, 271-285.

#### **Tocco 1978**

G. Tocco, La Basilicata nell'eta del Ferro, u: Atti della XX Riunione Scientifica dell'istituto Italiano di Preistoria e Protostoria in Basilicata 1976, Firenze, 1978, 87-122.

#### **Tomanič-Jevremov 1988**

M. Tomanič-Jevremov, Ormoško grobišče, u: Ormož skozi stoletja III, (ed. P. P. Klasnic), Ormož, 1988, 7-52.

#### **Tomanič-Jevremov 1989**

M. Tomanič-Jevremov, Žarno grobišče v Ormožu, Arheološki vestnik 39-40, Ljubljana, 1988-1989, 277-304.

#### **Tomas 2005**

H. Tomas, Mycenaean in Croatia?, u: Emporia, Aegeans in Central and Eastern Mediterranean. Proceedings of the 10th International Aegean Conference at the Italian School of Archaeology in Athens 2004, (ed. L. Godart, E. Greco, R. Laffineur, M. Marazzi, M. and A. Sacconi), Aegaeum 25, Liège, 2005, 673-682.

#### **Towle, Henderson, Bellintani, Gambacurta 2001**

A. Towle, J. Henderson, P. Bellintani, G. Gambacurta, Frattesina and Adria: Report of scientific analyses of early glass from the Veneto, Padva XXXVII, Pisa-Roma, 2001, 7-67.

#### **Trachsel 2004**

M. Trachsel, Untersuchungen zur relativen und absoluten Chronologie der Hallstattzeit, Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie 104, Bonn, 2004.

#### **Trampuž Orel 2012**

N. Trampuž Orel, The beginnings of iron in Slovenia, Arheološki vestnik 63, Ljubljana, 2012, 17-36.

#### Trampuž Orel, Heath 2001

N. Trampuž Orel, Heath, Depo Kanalski Vrh – študija o metalurškem znanju in kovin na začetku I. tisočletja pr. n.š., Arheološki vestnik, 52, Ljubljana, 2001, 143-171.

#### Truhelka 1902

Ć. Truhelka, Zwei prähistorische Funde aus Gorica (Bezirk Ljubuški), Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bosnia und der Herzegowina VIII, Sarajevo, 1902, 3-47.

#### Turk 1994

P. Turk, Depo iz Mušje jame pri Škocjanu, Magistrska naloga, Univerza v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, 1994.

#### Turk 1996

P. Turk, Datacija poznobronastodobnih depojev, u: Depojske in posamezne kovinske najdbe bakrene in bronaste dobe na Slovenskem II, (ed. B. Teržan), Katalogi in Monografije 30, Ljubljana, 1996, 89-124.

#### Turk 1997

P. Turk, Das Depot eines Bronzegeießers aus Slowenien – Opfer oder Materiallager?, u: Gaben an die Götter: Schätze der Bronzezeit Europas, (ed. A. und B. Hänsel), Berlin, 1997, 49-52.

#### Turk 2001

P. Turk, The weight of objects in Late Bronze Age hoards in Slovenia and possibilities for determining weight standards, Arheološki vestnik 52, Ljubljana, 2001, 249-279.

#### Turk 2009

P. Turk, Katalog. 17: 29 spenjalnih in okrasnih igel, fibule, u: A. Gaspari, N. Trampuž-Orel, P. Turk, Katalog-Prazgodovina, u: Ljubljana-kulturna dediščina reke, (ed. P. Turk, J. Istenič, T. Knific, T. Nabergoj), Ljubljana, 2009, 206-207.

#### Turk 2012

P. Turk, Archaeology in the Škocjan Caves Regional Park, u: The Škocjan Caves Park, (ed. B. Perić), Škocjan, 2012, 105-117.

#### Urban 1993

T. Urban, Studien zur mittleren Bronzezeit in Norditalien. Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorische Archäologie 14, Bonn, 1993.

#### Urleb 1974

M. Urleb, Križna gora pri Ložu. Halštatska nekropola, Katalogi in Monografije 11, Ljubljana, 1974.

#### Usai 2007

A. Usai, L'ambra nel percorso di sviluppo della Sardegna nuragica, u: Ambre. trasparenze dall'antico. Catalogo della mostra Napoli, 26 marzo-10 settembre 2007, (ed. M. L. Nava, A. Salerno), Napoli, 2007, 96-105.

#### Valvasor 1689

J. W. Valvasor, Die Ehre des Herzogthums Krein, Laibach, 1689.

#### Vasić 2003

R. Vasić, Die Nadeln im Zentralbalkan, Prähistorische Bronzefunde XIII/1, Stuttgart, 2003.

#### Vinski 1959

Z. Vinski, O prethistorijskim zlatnim nalazima u Jugoslaviji, Arheološki radovi i rasprave 1, Zagreb, 1959, 207-231.

#### Vinski 1961

Z. Vinski, O oružju ranog brončanog doba u Jugoslaviji, Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, N.s. 3, II, Zagreb, 1961 1-37.

#### Vinski-Gasparini 1970

K. Vinski-Gasparini, Mačevi s balčakom u obliku čaške, u: Adriatica Praehistorica et Antiqua, Miscellanea Gregorio Novak dicata, (ed. V. Miroslavljević, D. Rendić-Miočević, M. Suić), Zagreb, 1970, 161-172.

#### Vinski-Gasparini 1973

K. Vinski-Gasparini, Kultura polja sa žarama u sjevernoj Hrvatskoj, Monografije 1, Zadar, 1973.

#### Vinski-Gasparini 1983

K. Vinski-Gasparini, Kultura polja sa žarama sa svojim grupama, u: Praistorija Jugoslavenskih zemalja IV – Brončano doba, (ed. A. Benac), Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo, 1983, 547-646.

#### Vitri 1977

S. Vitri, Scavi 1896. Fondo Gombac, u: G. Steffè De Piero, S. Vitri, G. Righi, La necropoli di Brežec presso San Canziano del Carso. Scavi Marchesetti 1896-1900, Monografie di Preistoria degli "Atti dei Civici Musei di Storia ed Arte" I, Trieste, 1977, 63-95.

#### Vitri 1979

S. Vitri, La necropoli di Brežec presso S. Canziano e i suoi rapporti con i siti protostorici della valle dell'Isonzo, u: Le età del Bronzo e del Ferro nell'Isonzo, Atti del convegno di Studi, Gorizia 1977, Gorizia, 1979, 79-95.

#### Vitri 1983

S. Vitri, Grotta delle Mosche (Fliegenhöhle), u: Preistoria del Caput Adriae, (ed. C. Russo, A. Boiardi), Udine-Treiste, 1983, 145-149.

#### Voutsaki 1997

S. Voutsaki, The creation of value and prestige in the Aegean Late Bronze Age, European Journal of Archaeology 5,2, Cambridge, 1997, 34-52.

#### Vrdoljak 1995

S. Vrdoljak, Tipološka klasifikacija kasnobrončanodobne keramike iz naselja Kalnik-Igrišče (SZ. Hrvatska), Opvscvla Aarchaeologica 18, Zagreb, 1994, 7-81.

#### Vrkić, Maurin 2012

Š. Vrkić, D. Maurin, Žarni grob kulturne grupe Barice-Gređani iz Malinovca kod Našica, Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu 29, Zagreb, 2012, 135-142.

#### Vujević 2011

D. Vujević, Istraživanje tumula na Ljubačkoj kosi 2007. godine, Archaeologia Adriatica 5, Zadar, 2011, 1-31.

#### Weber 1996

C. Weber, Die Rasiermesser in Südosteuropa, Prähistorische Bronzefunde VIII/5, Stuttgart, 1996.

#### Weih's 2004

A. Weih's, Der urnenfelderzeitliche Depotfund von Peggau (Steiermark), Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie 114, Bonn, 2004.

#### Zanini, Martinelli 2005

A. Zanini, N. Martinelli, New Data on the Absolute Chronology of the Late Bronze Age in Central Italy, u: The Bronze Age in Europe and the Mediterranean, (ed. R. Laffiencour, J. Driessen, E. Warmenbol), BAR International Series 1337, Oxford, 2005, 147-155.

#### Žbona-Trkman, Bavdek 1996

B. Žbona-Trkman, A. Bavdek, Depojski najdbi s Kanalskega vrha, u: Depojske in posamezne kovinske najdbe bakrene in bronaste dobe na Slovenskem II, (ed. B. Teržan), Katalogi in Monografije 30, Ljubljana, 1996, 31-71.

#### Žeravica 1993


Z. Žeravica, Äxte und Beile aus Dalmatien und anderen Teilen Kroatiens, Montenegro, Bosnien und Herzegowina, Prähistorische Bronzefunde IX/18, Stuttgart, 1993.

#### Žic-Rokov 1962

I. Žic-Rokov, Ubikacija rimskog groblja i neki drugi problemi u Krku, Bulletin Zavoda za likovne umjetnosti JAZU 10, 1-2, Zagreb, 1962, 33-41.








155




156



157




158




160




161




159



163




162




164




166



167




165




168




170




169




171




172






173




174






176



175




178


177




179



180



181




182




184




185




183



186




187






203




205




204




206




207




208




209




210




211





212




213





214



215




216




217




218





219







220




221



222




223



224



225



226




227



228







229

230



It says only  
treasures personal and collective, beloved  
me, but also my and our common part. In the course of  
they get a chance to be part interested, which  
much of their meaning.  
about the period of the  
to the 1st millennium  
"object" of my part  
"form" which many  
often required  
of that object  
and  
of that material  
will



