In autumn 2005 a second campaign of archaeological research on the site of Stari Bar has been carried out. In agreement with the Montenegrin authorities (Museum of Bar – Town of Bar) the archaeological project involved the collaboration of the University of Ca’ Foscari in Venice and Primorska University in Koper (Slovenia). While the team directed by prof. Mitja Gusčin studied Ottoman pottery from the Museum and the storage area of the site of Bar, the team under my direction worked together with Mladen Zagarcanin of the Museum of Bar on the implementation of the archaeological research at the site. In this volume, a part of the results of that campaign are published.

This book, like the first one on Stari Bar, remains a collection of papers. A group of articles focus on topics connected with the areas excavated in 2005 (UTS 45, UTS 112 and UTS 8b), a paper presents the archaeozoological analysis of context from the trench of 2004 (UTS 161) and another one gives a wide overview of stoneworking in Bar through the centuries. An article then aims to give a preliminary interpretation of the settlement sequence of the area, through the collation of new data and pre-existing archaeological knowledge.

The team of 2005, under my direction, was constituted by Corinna Bagato, Fulvio Baudo, Diego Calaon, Erica D’Amico, Cristina Fallá, Speranza Freisì, Alessandro Gasparin and Elena Grandi of the University of Ca’ Foscari in Venice; by Mladen Zagarcanin of the Museum of Bar; by Aleksander Pluskowski and Krish Seetah of the University of Cambridge; by Milos Petrivec of the University of Beograd.

The project was funded by the European Union (Culture 2000. The Heritage of Serenissima), the Ministero degli Esteri Italiano (MAE) and by Region Veneto. In this occasion we want to express our gratitude to those that have helped and supported this mission also in 2005. For the Montenegrin side the Minister of Culture Mrs Vesna Kilibarda, the Chief of Cultural Heritage Mr Slobodan Mitrović, the Mayor of the Municipality of Bar in 2005 Mrs Anka Vojvodic, the director of the Center for Culture of Bar Mr Milun Lutovac, the curator of the Museum of Bar Mr Vladislav Kasalika and the conservator of the archaeological area of Bar Mr Omer Peročević. For the Italian side the Consul for Montenegro in 2005, Mrs Valentina Setta, the dean of the University Ca’ Foscari Mr Pierfrancesco Ghetti, the functionaries of Regione Veneto, our colleague Gilberto Calderoni of the Laboratory of Earth Science of University “La Sapienza” of Rome for the C14 analysis and our colleague Paolo Biagi of University of Ca’ Foscari in Venice for his help with the micro-lithics of the site.

This project enjoys the support of the Archaeological Society of Montenegro and was officially presented to the 4th Meeting on Montenegrin Archaeology (IV Skup. Društvo Arheologija Crne Gore) held in Danilovgrad from the 18th to the 20th of October 2005. During the excavation we were visited by our friend Mr Mile Baković (Centra za arheološka istraživanja Crne Gore and now President of the Archaeological Society of Montenegro) and by Mr Djurge Jančović (Faculty of Philosophy, Beograd).

While finishing the preparation of this book we received the sad news of the sudden passing of our friend Milan Pravilović, former President of the Archaeological Society of Montenegro and eminent scholar of Montenegrin archaeology. Milan repeatedly visited us on the excavation in Bar in 2004 and 2005, giving us many valuable suggestions and opinions. We are sure he would have supported us in the same way in the future. With affection and fondness we dedicate this volume to his memory.

SAURO GELICHI

Venice, August 2006
1.1 **Stari Bar: a short introduction**

Stari Bar is an abandoned town in Montenegro, lying on a rocky hill 5 km away from modern Bar (the most important harbour of Montenegro) (Plate 1.1), along that part of the coast between the mouths of Cattaro (Kotor) and the estuary of the Bojana, on which important Roman-Hellenistic centres were founded, like Budva (*Butua*) and Ulcinj (*Dulcinium*) (for a preliminary introduction to the site see Gelichi 2005, 2006 and Zagarcˇanin 2005).

The site of Stari Bar appears at first glance as a reasonably homogeneous settlement (Plate 1.2-1.3). Surrounded by the last of a series of curtain walls built in the Venetian period, the town extends over an area of about 4 hectares with a loosely lozenge-shaped plan, to which a final district commonly called *suburbium* was added at a date which has not been determined precisely (between the 12th and the 15th century), outside the walls but in turn surrounded by another curtain wall.

It is well known that conflicts (the Montenegro Liberation War) first and natural events later (an earthquake in 1979) have seriously damaged what was left of the town. However even in these conditions Stari Bar immediately stands out as a site with great potential both for the degree of preservation of its historical masonry and for the quality and depth of archaeological levels. It represents an important opportunity for the analysis of the development of a medieval and postmedieval settlement; one that avoided the heavy urban transformation that almost always have totally destroyed the phisonomy of Montenegrin historical towns in the last century.

A first surface analysis shows how evidently the architectural heritage of this abandoned town is somehow made homogeneous by its last phase of occupation, corresponding to the Ottoman domination (Plate 1.4). Not only are some public spaces typical of Islamic towns still visible, like the hammam (recently restored) and the mosques, but also common buildings, in particular if emptied of debris and thus showing the internal divi-
sion of space, share some constructive characteristics and architectural elements (staircases, doors, chimneys) that are typical of the settlements of these lands in the Modern period. This homogeneity appears even more evident if we observe attentively the few surviving photos of the town before the destructions of the last quarter of the 19th century (Plate 1.5), where the presence of wooden buildings is almost standard, with outwardly projecting upper floors which of course have subsequently vanished. In reality, this apparent coating of a “typical Balkan village” is lost with more detailed analysis. For a start the town is characterized by several Christian religious buildings (about 16 churches, chapels and monasteries have been identified at present) (Plate 1.6), all transformed in the Ottoman period (like the cathedral turned into a mosque or the church of St. Catherine) but that nonetheless have not lost their full recognizability. Even the houses appear to be the result of long-lasting though undramatic transformations. Some buildings then still show friezes and openings typical of Venetian masonry of the 15th and 16th century. Finally, even the northern, northwestern and northeastern sectors of fortifications show clearly both in the building characteristics and the architectural modalities employed to have been influenced by the same models that were inspiring the Venetian architects of the period (for an overview of masonry of this period see MARCHESI 1984).

The preservation of the settlement after the first investigations and restorations of Bošković and after the earthquake of 1979 that further damaged the crumbling structures of the site, have already been evaluated, discussed and analyzed previously (GEIČIĆ 2003, BAUDO 2005, CALAON 2005a). This is not the place then to raise these issues again. In the following pages I would like instead to discuss the characteristics and the nature of the archaeological documentation known for the territory of Bar and in concluding to reconsider the strategies on the basis of the results of the archaeological campaign of 2005.
data as well as ancient written sources. In the area of the coast of Bar, at present, no trace has been found of settlement that could suggest the presence of even a minor nucleus (like a *vicus*) which may have been ignored by written sources. The presence of a Triconch church near the site of Topolica (modern Bar) and to which we will return, is on one side meaningful archaeological data that cannot however be automatically used to prove the existence of an important settlement in this area before the Late Antique or Byzantine period (and possibly not even in that period).

The second aspect is that the absence of major settlements seems to have been compensated, at least from the Late Imperial Age, by a series of *villae*, testified by direct archaeological finds (mosaics and structures) or indirectly, as, for example, for the small group of tombs found in Sutomore in 1971 (MARIKOVIĆ 1971, pp. 53-57) (Plate 1.7). In fact from this locality three tombs were identified, one of which contained personal objects and clothing, among which a bronze belt-buckle (*ibid.* Tabla I, fig. 3) and in particular a cruciform fibula (*Zwiebelknopffibeln*) (*ibid.* Tabla I, fig. 2) (bronze cruciform fibula with short bow and long trapezoid catchplate decorated with a pair of ‘eyelets’) (Plate 1.8, nn. 5 and 2). The belt buckle, with an oval ring with semicircular section and S-shaped indentation where the bow was closing, and a rectangular catchplate made of folded metal plates and solded with two small nails, can be compared with pieces dating to the second half of the 4th century (CAVALLARI 2005, n. 11, pp. 147-148). The Latin cross fibula (see a similar example in PETKOVIĆ, RUDIC 2005, pp. 80-85), without bow and spring, belongs to a category of products typical of male clothing that dates to the end of the 3rd and the middle of the 5th century (on
Plate 1.6 – Stari Bar 14th-15th century. Churches and monasteries.

Plate 1.7 – Montenegrin coast in the Late Imperial Age. Main Archaeological Sites.
Plate 1.8 – Objects from graves in Sutomore.

Plate 1.9 – Villa of Kruče.
different areas of the villa have been preserved. They are decorated with white, red, black and gray tesserae and are dated to the 6th century by comparison with the church I of Stobi and above all by the fact that coins of the emperors Anastasius, Justin I and Justinian were found in the villa. However the structure is likely to be more ancient and these materials simply reflect the last phase of occupation of the site. The villa (defined as villa rustica) is related with the exploitation of agricultural and maritime resources (olive growing and fishing) that would have been improved by the easy access to the bay (ibid., p. 121). Very close to the bay a large area of thousand-year-old olive trees is indeed found, and many of these could have already been planted at the time of construction of the villa.

The villa of Kruče closely resembles the one of Petrovac: for its position (on the coast and near a natural harbour), for the presence of rooms decorated with mosaics and ultimately for its chronology. The possibility that their function could be related with the exploitation of latifunds is at the moment only hypothetical, because the rooms excavated so far only appear to have had a residential function. Meaningful data on the characteristics of the masonry are totally lacking, however they do not appear to have been following the fortified models typical of a series of rural villae present in Late Antiquity Dalmatia (Rendić-Miočević 1984, pp. 108-109). It is possible however that these villae are the most sensitive archaeological evidence of a scattered settlement that remains almost invisible because of the absence of planned and detailed archaeological research. The chronologies proposed for the two complexes need to be rediscussed on the basis of more secure archaeological evidence. It is not possible at the moment to build a credible model of settlement patterns on the basis of these data. In nearby areas for example, even if in a different position in relation to the urban settlement (the area of Butrint), it has been hypothesised that instead of clustering there was a division of property in Late Antiquity (Hodges, Bowden 2005, p. 14). Residential structures of this nature are nonetheless clearly the expression of a middle-high class of possessores that lived in the area in Late Antiquity.

A third aspect is represented by religious buildings (often defined, because of their chronology, as palaeochristian: for a general overview see Mijović 1987, pp. 93-94). The most meaningful on the coast, part of the recently excavated religious complex at Ulcinj (Bošković et alii 1980, where a famous ciborium was found), is surely the so called Triconch of Topolina, unfortunately badly excavated in the ‘50s and ‘60s and basically reconstructed. Some liturgical implements (Zagarcin 7, infra) are preserved from this complex that we will discuss later (infra 2), but the function and especially the relationship with the settlement are still unknown and hypothetical. The archaeology of religious structures can draw on some extensive excavations (the near monastery of Ratač, for example, Bošković 1962, pp. 180-186 or the monastery of the Holy Archangels of Prevlaka, in the gulf of Kotor: Korac 2001a). However the general interest is towards the planimetric reconstruction of the buildings, the analysis of the liturgical furnishing or to the study of the architectural particularities of the complex, as it is also the case at the important site of Martinići (Korac 2001b). This type of archaeology does not contribute much to the understanding of settlement dynamics, the quality and nature of settling structures and the characteristics of the economy. It is no coincidence that there are few studies on post-antique manufacts which are almost always limited to catalogues (Post antique pottery from the monastery of Prevlaka, Pasic 2004, or glass from urban finds in Kotor).

The archaeological research of the site of Stari Bar has to be situated within this framework. In his monograph published in 1962 (Bošković 1962) after the works accomplished in the ‘50s, Bošković took into consideration every historical-documentary source (from cartography to epigraphy, apart, of course, from the analysis of the extant buildings), but the archaeological aspect (which follows the scientific environment of the time and the formation of the scholar) is almost absent or linked to inadequate principles and methods. The excavation trenches were in fact quite limited (the foundation of the semicircular tower UTS 112, ibid., p. 78, fig. 101, and the area of the church of St. George ibid. pp. 9-20) and the attention to the finds of these excavations was limited to some pottery (defined as Slav) near the complex 112 and to early medieval stoneworks uncovered during the excavation, aimed at bringing to light the foundations of the cathedral. However, through some considerations on the urban plan and the architectural aspect of the town, Bošković was able to present a valid evolutionary interpretation of the settlement, with increasing precision as he got closer to the Middle Ages and the Modern Age. But the earliest phase is totally hypothetical. After the earthquake of 1979, new research on the site of Bar was undertaken within the context of the project of renewing architectural restoration of the town. In this circumstance many areas were cleared of debris for the first time and in many rooms the deposits have been dug out. In some cases excavation trenches have reached the bedrock (8b), completely removing the archaeological deposit (as in room 13). During these intensive and extensive recovery operations whole districts and building complexes have been uncovered, that Bošković did not manage to document (for example, the western one) and many dump pits full of materials have been excavated, yielding in particular glass and pottery of the Venetian age (Zagarcin 2004). Also in this period of hyperactivity new buildings were discovered (a church in the area of the Citadel: Baudis 2005, Plate 3.2) along with some graves, some painted, inside what has been interpreted as the archbishop’s palace (Bošković 1962, pp. 134-135) (Plate 1.10). Eventually a massive restoration programme was put into place (the curtain walls, the Citadel) and some buildings have been reconstructed (or built from scratch) such as the church of St. Veneranda, in order to use them for occasional performances, as storage areas, laboratories or exhibition halls. The result of this frantic excavation activity
is a huge quantity of materials of varying age, some of which are exhibited in a room at the Museum of Bar and others in a small Antiquarium in the archaeological area. The most meaningful scientific result of this long period of research is, apart from some new informative brochures (PEROČEVić 2002), the book that Mladen Zagarcanin dedicated to the pottery of the Venetian period (ZAGARCANIN 2004).

1.3 The project

In 2004 a new archaeological project was started, the aims and strategies of which have already been presented in a previous work (GELICHI 2005) and that was carried out in October 2005.

The main aspects we aimed to investigate were:

a) the reconstruction of a safe settlement sequence (in particular for the phases before the 13th century, almost totally absent from the extant material evidence)

b) the identification of the socio-economical matrix that was underlying the fortune of the site and that was showing its development through time

c) the social characterization in the use of space, the exploitation of resources and the daily life in the longue durée.

After the first year dedicated to the study and definition of the state of preservation of the archaeological resource (BAUDO 2005, CALAON 2005a) and to test the characteristics and nature of stratification (trench UTS 161 in the Citadel, CALAON 2005b), we moved on, in 2005, to a more articulated approach that would have allowed us to focus in more detail on the above mentioned points.

The first issue was approached from two points of view. On the one hand, in fact, some materials interpreted as Late Antique finds by recent and not so recent excavations have been analysed. This study allowed us to understand more clearly the character and nature of the available archaeological documentation for the centuries.
of Late Antiquity (Gelicchi 2, infra). However it was still necessary to verify the existence (or absence) *in situ* of deposits relating to that period, considering that trench UTS 161 which had already demonstrated the possible presence of such early levels, was not homogeneously spread throughout the town. The second action then aimed to open a couple of trenches in areas that showed hints of being related to this aspect. The first sector was identified in the area of gate 112, that Bošković interpreted as a Middle Byzantine portal. The identification of a second semicircular tower, hidden by the walls of the nearby building, never identified nor excavated, allowed different opportunities (Bošković 1962 fig. 95, here redrawn as Plate 1.11). The first one was to be certain of its existence. The second was to verify if, as Bošković imagined, an earlier phase with square towers existed. The third opportunity was the identification of *in situ* deposits related with the tower that could allow us to date it more precisely (Plate 1.12).

A second sector was identified in the area of rooms 8a-b (in reality two different even if communicating buildings) near the church of St. Catherine (*ibid.*, n.
These rooms are in fact inside the area that Bošković identified as the most ancient nucleus of Stari Bar. In his opinion the settlement would have developed from the highest point in the site (roughly corresponding to the area defined as n. 1, that is the church of St. George) to room 11 (a gate to the south-west of the settlement) and to room 51 (near the church of St. Veneranda) (Bošković 1962, fig. 277, p. 195 and p. 327). Moreover, in 2000, Mladen Zagarčanin and Omer Perocaniv excavated a small trench in room 8b, near the foundation wall of the church of St. Catherine (Zagarčanin 2004, pp. 24-26). In this trench materials of Late Antique age and remains of a burial were found, which raised the hope in situ levels of the period.

Opening the trench in UTS 8a-b also allowed us to tackle points b) and c). In area 8b in fact, partially already razed, a High Medieval phase could still be documented (as in fact happened: see Calaon, D’Amico, Fresia 4, infra), whereas room 8a, still mainly untouched, could contain Ottoman age strata. The research in this area, near which the fill of a building had already been excavated (building 15, Zagarčanin 2004, p. 26), was useful for analysing a sample of settlement (in a sector that was considered the oldest one, supra), where the characteristics and the nature of the deposits could be related with the transformation of the building in the longue durée. Moreover it was an opportunity to build a good chrono-typological sequence of materials, in this case for the Late Medieval and the Ottoman age. Preliminary results for the Late Medieval pottery are published in this volume (D’Amico in Calaon, D’Amico, Fresia 4, infra).

In order to improve this aspect we also decided to excavate a third sector (UTS 45), on the plain area near the church of St. Veneranda (Bošković 1962, n. 48, pp. 36-40), corresponding with a series of rooms hypothetically linked with the property of the church and then of the likely Dominican monastery (ibid. p. 35) (Plate 1.4). This area as well seemed to have been significantly transformed in the Ottoman age into a housing complex. The situation was then particularly intriguing for the possibilities it offered to analyse the methods and characteristics of de-functionalization of a very precisely characterized space in the Medieval and Late Medieval age. Even if the research demonstrated that Bošković’s hypothesis was incorrect, and showed that the area was almost completely empty of stratification earlier than the late Ottoman age, the excavation presented the opportunity to study in detail the organisation of a housing space born and transformed during the Ottoman age (Baudo, Calaon, D’Amico 5, infra). Moreover this excavation (together with 8a) allowed us to uncover a good context of late Ottoman age (pottery, glass, animal bones, metals, etc.) that together with those identified and studied in UTS 161 (D’Amico 2005 and Settah, Pluskowski 6, infra in this volume) will allow us to recognize and focus on one of the most visible socio-cultural transformations of the site during Modern era.