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Annales Mediterranea
The purpose of this study is to illustrate the reflections of Picens’ impact in the Kvarner Bay through the impact of jewellery and the specifics of its context in the folk costume of the local population, depending on the trends or universal phenomena, mediation or commerce.

Kvarner is the area of the northern Adriatic coast between the Istrian peninsula, with mountain Učka in the west and Velebit in the east. In the western part of the bay are the islands of Cres and Lošinj, and in the eastern Krk, Rab and northern part of the island of Pag, with the associated smaller island groups (Fig. 1). Kvarner has a distinctive geo-strategic position as the Adriatic Sea as well as the Mediterranean Sea is penetrating the most in the European land. The islands guard the coast and at the same time provide a horizontal, as well as vertical, communication within the bay, which implies the ultimate control of the sea routes. Archaeological works in that area have been conducted since the 19th century. However, a small number of literature and systematic studies is currently available.1

According to the more or less successful interpretations so far, Kvarner has been considered a part of the cultural group of the Liburnians of the late Bronze and Iron Age (Fig. 1).2 The Liburnians were known as the masters of the sea, with well-developed skills of shipbuilding and seafar-

---

1 The most important works are those of Carlo Marchesetti (1903; 1924), Šime Batović (1965; 1976; 1987), Fulvia Lo Schiavo (1970) and Dunja Glogović (1989, 2002).
No doubt, Kvarner is an area brimming with economic contacts and cultural currents, mostly due to its geographic position, but the terrain as well. As mentioned earlier, Kvarner has a coastal and insular area, both connected and mutually inseparable, but separate and independent at the same time. That is the very reason why an ethnic group that inhabited the area has not been clearly defined until today. The fact that it is impossible to gather new findings fast is enhanced by the inadequate level of exploration with a large number of lacunas, which, once completed, will probably or certainly alter the existing image of the topic. Naturally, certain circumstances of the findings depended on the relationship of political forces at the time, especially on the sea, as well as in the inland (Fig. 1). For example, the theory of the Liburnian supremacy on the sea during the early Iron Age is widely accepted. Or, the assumptions of the Iapodian dominance in the whole area of the Kvarner coastline during the late Iron Age are justified. However, completely opposite hypotheses are being supported. Furthermore, material findings that supersede the borders of tribal communities and are a part of a universal trend or possibility, trade or other means of communication are not always the best support when examining ethnic communities.

It is a well-known fact that Kvarner has been a place where the communication and mediatory paths of goods and cultural impulses intertwined as early as the late Bronze Age. However, adopting the cultural trends and influences from the wider Mediterranean area usually resulted in typical expression of the Caput Adriae area. Developing into full Iron Age that system became a more solid network, but also continued the trend of transforming and adapting the adopted to one’s own taste, with clear traditional or even conservative approaches. Still, the more prominent

---

import indicated that more solid liaisons with Italy were established especially the Picenes and the south of Italy, Balkan, and south-eastern Pre-Alps region cultural circle in particular.

Distribution of certain objects, the repertoire of findings in general, as well as the logic of what was the most natural communication route, indicate three completely certain means of trade via Kvarner: 1) from Aquileia and Postojna across Notranjska (Inner Carniola) and Okra, 2) from Dolnenjska (Lower Carniola) across Vinica, i.e. Colapian and Iapodian territory, and 3) of course, via sea, with Picenes as mediators, later Spina, across the islands of Kvarner, Lošinj-Cres-Krk (Fig. 2). That route could have been part of a very important mediatory route from the largest and the most developed manufacturing centres of Italy at the time, towards the Iapodian territory that was very fond of Greek and Italian products. Kvarner became the place of constant trade of semi-products and products, a transitory fairground where most various forms of cultural gatherings took place. In Kvarner existed one of the biggest Adriatic fairgrounds of the time – Osor/Apsorus (Cres), and judging by the type of findings, such was the southern part of island Krk, (Krk, Punat and Baška) and then island Rab (Fig. 2).

There it was possible to trade towards Iapodian mainland, across the Velebit coastline, but vice versa as well, form the continent towards the islands. Many authors agree with this, supporting the data of ancient written sources. Of particular importance is the route of inter-insular trajectory, related to a well-known flow of the goods via the so-called outward sea route, which went directly across Osor. This has been often used to explain the presence, and absence, of certain findings in Kvarner. Therefore, it is interesting to note that certain material findings do not cross the borders of the insular zone, in accordance with the present status of examinations. They are maintained as direct results of import designed for further distribution, without any tendencies to become part of folk costume that the locals would adopt. Direct individual contact should not be underestimated here, nor the effects had that piracy and plundering activities of the local seamen.

This is obvious in the example of two-part serpentine fibulae (Fig. 3), known in Picenum as the element of the 1st phase, i.e. end of the 10th and 9th century. A direct import from the Italic grounds is the fibula from Osor (Fig. 3).
3), as well as somewhat older fibula type from Klačenica. Furthermore, in the inner part of the bay, in Garica (Krk), Grižane (Fig. 3) or Novalja (Pag), are the examples of fibulae of so-called Adriatic koiné. However, they clearly suggest the features of older traditions, Urnefield culture especially, in the way (e.g. type and style) the adopted motive was transformed, with the emphasis on the type of pins. Similar goes for the pins with disc-shaped and profiled head, noted on Gromačica (Rab) and on Klačenica. Typologically comparable findings can be traced with the Liburnians and Picenian, but no doubt in the cultural circle of Bologna I (IB). According to the above described, fibula and pin from Klačenica are most probably a consequence of the same import or contact from the Italic coast. Furthermore, the pins of Sirolo type belong here, which also represent Adriatic koiné, 9th and 8th century, according to Renato Peroni. Only two examples of that type are known, from Osor and Cres, but unfortunately, without a more specific context of finding. Pins with twisted neck, type I, according to Maša Sakara Sučević, but a variety with little horns, have been found, typical of the southern part of Istria, on Karst, in Liburnia and in Picenum.

Certain findings of folk costume which are result of the Adriatic koiné trend, have been documented both in insular and coastal area. Interaction of influences and cultural inflows from continental parts of the Pre-Alps region is obvious, as was typical of the universal changes of the end of the 9th and 8th century. Thanks to this mixture of pressures the things remained longer in use, as clothing objects or in some other cult or spiritual expression. Such are various types and forms of pins with conical head typical of pins.

---


13 For Italy see also: Merhart 1942: 4-5, Taf. 2; Kilian 1971: 224, Abb. 3; Peroni 1976: 108; and works of: D’Ercole 1977: Tav. 33: B 345; Tocco 1978: 96-98, Fig. 4c; Eles Masi 1985: Nr. 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, Tav. VII: e. Only one such fibula with a spiral disc on the foot, as a direct import from Italy, has been found in France dip. Giura, while the fibula with a oval shaped disc are somewhat more common; Adam 1992: 383, Fig. 6: J, Fig. 8. There is also one such fibula with a oval shaped disc documented in Bulgaria; Gergova 1987: Nr. 234.


17 Ancona and P. S. Elpidio: Carancini 1975: Nr. 1902, 1904, 1918; Trachsel 2004: 226, Abb. 134; see different chronology by Pare 1998: 310-311, Abb. 7.

18 Carancini 1975: Nr. 275: 1902, 1904, 1918; Trachsel 2004: 226, Abb. 134; see different chronology by Pare 1998: 310-311, Abb. 7.

19 Pare 1998: 310-311, Abb. 7.


22 Sakara Sučević 2004: 18-20; Pare 1998, Abb. 13:9. Pins type Sirolo from the areas of Lika and Bosnia do not belong to this group; see proposition of typology Lucentini in this volume.
the end of the HaB2/3 and the HaC1 horizon, and multi-headed pins of various kinds from the 8th and 7th century, during the horizon HaC1/C2. Conical-headed pins of P. S. Elpidio type, after Carancini, are known only from Osor and Nin, and have not been noted in littoral area yet (Fig. 4). They are very exceptional and diverse, while the examples from the southeast Pre-Alps region are typical of the early Iron Age as well as in Este IIB phase. Conical-headed pins of the Vadena type, after Carancini, have been found in the continental, as well as in the littoral region of the Kvarner Bay (Fig. 4). They can be found beyond Istria, across the Liburnian - Iapodian territory to the Pre-Alps region, and they are typical for Este IIA phase. They could have reached Kvarner in somewhat altered forms via Karst, as well as sea routes. Pin of the Caprara type, after Carancini, is, so far, known only from Klaćenica. It is also a possible result of the Italic influence, especially from Bologna cultural circle, via southeast Pre-Alps region (Fig. 4). Multi-headed pins of the Este type, Redipuglia type, after Carancini, or multi-headed pins with a trumpet-shaped terminal are typical of the littoral Kvarner region (Fig. 5), and are characteristic for Bologna IIIA I IIB phase. Their presence can also be found in other regions such as Istria, St. Lucija, Notranjska and Dolenjska (Fig. 5). Some examples are made of iron plate, originating from the cultural circle of Dolenjska, and are well-known from the necropolises of Istria.

Widely spread is also the spectacle fibula, defined in several types, according to Glogović, also documented in the entire area of Kvarner. They occur individually or often in composition with other objects of costume (Fig. 6). As they belong to the 2nd phase in Picenum, they occur

---

35 Rijeka: Glogović 1989: T. 8: 3; Blečić 2003: Kat. XVIII: 82-83.
36 Mihovilč 2001: 79-80, Sl. 64.
much later than in the eastern Adriatic coast. That is why they were believed to be the work of the Balkan masters and that they were transported via sea routes. However, only in the insular area, i.e. Osor, they can be found in a composition with bow fibulae with amber pearl on the bow, identified in two types according to Dunja Glogović and Aleksandar Palavestra. The closest and the most numerous analogies can be found on Iapodian territory and in Liburnia, even if extremely solid parallels can be drawn with the graves of Este, Ca Morta and Bologna, Benacci Caprara, and of course in Picenum (Fig. 6). These fibulae, according to numerous authors, are considered to be typical jewellery region of the so-called Adriatic koiné, as well as their frequent findings with the spectacle fibulae, e.g. of the Iapodians or Picenians. Nevertheless, to make things less typical, the Osor type fibula comes into picture. Even though its genesis can be traced with confidence from the knownItalic types of fibula a disco. Osor type fibula consist of two parts, which will be absent at its Picenian variety of this fibula consist of one part. Osor type fibula is typical luxurious jewellery only of the insular Kvarner region and part of Liburnia. On all fibulae amber polygonal pearl was added on the long leg, which is not the case with the other local subtype of the same fibula from Punat (Krk). It is important to mention that all three types of fibulae are present in the joint composition only in Zaton where the

38 Lollini 1976: 129, Fig. 4: 6; Lucentini 1999: 128, 258.
40 Osor: Mladin 1960: T. 8: 1, 2, 5; T. 9: 2-3; Glogović 2003: Nr. 256-259, 274, 294; Palavestra 1993: 64, 213; Palavestra 2006: 46, Fig. 17.
44 Novilara: Fondo Molaroni, grave 70; Beinhauer 1985: Taf. 18D, 19A; see also f. n. 41.
45 Merhart 1942: Abb. 1, Taf. 2; also Trachsel 2004: 198-218, Abb. 127, 134.
47 Marchesetti 1924: Fig. 8; Mladin 1960: 219, 222, T. 13; Glogović 1982: 74-84, T. 2-4; Glogović 2003: Nr. 335-342.
48 Lo Schiavo 1970: 424, Tav. XXII: 1; Glogović 2003: Nr. 348; Mader 2005: 434, Fig. 3.
famous and identical fibula of the Osor type is. So, this particular local feature in costume became prominent. It was adopted at first, but otherwise it is a typical part of the jewellery of the Adriatic basin in the horizon HaC1/C2, i.e. Liburnia II phase. It is certain that Osor had a jewellery workshop, and its goods could have easily arrived at Zaton by commercial, mediatory or exogamy ways. Besides, the use of that fibula could have a much longer range, as far as 6th-5th century. In addition, amber in its oval, round or flat pearls with various perforations has been noted in 5 out of a total of 7 tumuli in Osor – only in female and children graves (as defined by A. Palavestra). Some of the pearl types have their direct analogies with the necklaces from Krk and Grobnik or Kastav, which can be compared to the ones in Picenum. The said types belong mostly to the context of the Ha D2/3.

Fibulae that reflex clear exchange of goods via external sea route, that is, the direct contact by trade, mediation or other with the Italic area are leech-shaped fibula and boat-shaped fibula with two knobs on the bow. A leech-shaped fibula is atypical of Liburnia, as well as Kvarner. The finding from Osor is a transitive form of fibula in the direction of the real leech-shaped fibula, which can be traced in Estenian IIB/IIC and Bologna IIA cultural circle. A boat-shaped fibula with two knobs on the bow is known from Osor, Liburnia, but found also in nearby Istria, Iapodian territory and in Picenum. In the area of St. Lucija, as well as in the wider region of the Pre-Alps area, they indicate the turn of the 7th century, St. Lucija Ic2. As this fibula does not belong to the said divisions,

---

49 Batović 1965: Abb. 14; Glogović 2003: Nr. 344.
50 If we consider its presence with the fibulae of the Baška type in Nin, grave 3 (Glogović 1982: 82-84; Glogović 2003: 72, Nr. 343).
it too reflects direct contact with the Italic coast. However, the examples of the opposite contact via cultural circles of the areas of St. Lucija and Notranjska or Iapodian territory are a imitation of Šmarjeta type fibula from Jurjevo or the appearance of the boat-shaped fibula with three knobs on the bow in Bakar, type Grottazzolina or Type 2 after Marija Ogrin (Fig. 7), which occur by the end of the 7th century and last well into the 6th century, during the Piceno IV A phase. The boat-shaped fibula with three knobs on the bow is a famous part of the folk costume on the Iapodian territory, as well as with the Istrians, a bit less present with the Liburnians, but by all means typical of the folk costume of the Picenes in the middle and southern Italy. It is probable that it reached Bakar via Dolenjska or sea route by the mediation of the Picenes (Fig. 7).

The proto Certosa fibula with a pearl on its leg is a phenomenon typical of the wider Adriatic basin in 2/2 7th and in the 6th century. Therefore, we can find them in the necropolises of Kastav, Rijeka, Gromačica and Osor, as well as in all the neighbouring cultural groups of the Kvarner region, and are well dated in Picenum, IVA and B phases, same as in Apulia (Fig. 8). Judging by their diffusion, they were transferred via sea, so it is possible that this is the origin of the proto Certosa fibula from Osor, and via overland routes, linked to the specimens of Rijeka and Kastav, mostly influenced by the groups of Pre-Alps cultural circle.

Bow fibula with a C sectioned leg and a bird head terminal from Krk is also witness to a series of dynamic and intertwined relationships and specific liaisons, present throughout the 6th century. The chart of its spread at Biba Teržan points to wider contacts, where the Kvarner islands, with the maritime and commercial connections, held a very important role.

Another famous form of Adriatic fibula developed from the proto Certosa fibula – it is the Baška type, again thanks to the sea routes that connected coasts of the Adriatic Sea (Fig. 8). Present in the Balkan and in the middle and southern Italy, it shows that it had probably developed in Italy from the fibulae of the proto Certosa type with a pearl on its leg, under the strong influence of the Hellenistic artistic achievements of the 3rd/2nd centuries.

As shown, Osor as the southernmost port of Kvarner was a part of an extremely important external sea route (Fig. 2). At the same time, it was the first barrier and sea

---

59 Težak-Gregl 1984: 3-5, Sl. 1; After Dunja Glogović it is leech-shaped fibula type, variant B; Glogović 2003: 87-88, Nr. 412; for the Šmarjeta type fibulae see Teržan 1990: K. 16; Teržan 2000: 42-43, Abb. 87.
61 Lollini 1976: 140, Fig. 11; Ogrin 1998: 119, Sl. 26; probably belongs to her type 2d.
62 Dreschsler-Bižić 1987: 406, Sl. 24: 15, Tab. XLIV: 12, 15; Hiller 1991: 106-109, Abb. 32; Balen-Letunić 2004: 238, Cat. 50.2; Mihovilić 2001: Tab. 22, 3 (G. 1-12), 39, 1; 55: 1-5; Glogović 2003: Nr. 476; 99-100; From Novalja, Dabovi stanovi (Pag), boat-shaped fibula with three knobs on the bow (Batović 1976: Tav. 18; 3), see also Lollini 1976: Fig. 11; 18; Preložnik in this volume.
control point. That is why it had such an important role as a big trading transfer of goods, both as mediator and distributor, and as a centre that used elements of universal trends and made them typical of local costume. Osor as such bears the most similarity with the Liburnian and Piacen- 

nian cultural circle. The open question is and remains the nature of relationship itself. Did the seamen from Picenum transport the goods directly to Osor, and then act as mediators with other communities in the northern Adriatic? Or was that famous connection direct between the Picenes and Liburnians, between Liburnians and Osor? The link in the inner part of the bay is a bit more certain. It stretched from the first north-western rocks of the islands of Pag and Rab, and southern part of the island of Krk. The channel of Krk provided a fast and transit route on the way to the coastal area below Velebit and then via Iapodian territory, natural- 

ly, with local seamen or noble men as mediators. However, the contact was surely made by direct and well-determined overland routes between Liburnians and Iapodes, but also via inner sea routes, from Liburnia to the coastal line of Velebit and the bay of Rijeka, which was undoubtedly a re- gion of sea trade of “dangerous” Iapodes (Fig. 1). Whichever the case, material legacy of the rest of Kvarner in its north speaks volumes of the intensive interaction and cul- 

tural and social influences from the Italic world, via south- 

eastern Pre-Alps region.74 Furthermore, a strong feeling of conservatism is present towards new or unknown. If a motive was adopted, or a product even, especially a part of a costume, it usually reflected traditional method of manu- 

facturing, adjusted to the local needs, using the methods of deeply rooted tradition. In the end, I would like to re-

turn to the beginning! Taken into consideration the present situation of archaeological level of exploration, as well as the possibilities of its interpretation, the Picenian influence in Kvarner is obvious as indirect and mediatory, identified mostly in its insular region. Stronger interaction or mutual influence, as known among neighbouring cultural groups, is not plausible.

From this brief review one may conclude that, besides the commercial activities there were numerous intellec- 

tual relations between communities and within a wider cultural circle that were not discussed in this article. One thing is certain – these relations were not at all simple or linear, but on the contrary, very complex and dynamic, and conducted according to hierarchical social principles of their times.

---

74 Guštin 1987: 46-55; Blečić 2004: 89-90, 94.
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