

PREFACE

The present volume is the product of the desire to assemble as many inputs from the scholars of this field as possible, cantered around the generic theme *The Carpathian Basin and the Northern Balkans between 3500 and 2500 BC: Common Aspects and Regional Differences*.

The present subject is quite generous in its wide range of possible approaches, but its actuality is obvious. We must confess that we would have wanted more contributions to this volume, but we are aware that it is increasingly difficult for scholars to honour such calls, since many of our colleagues are involved in research and publication projects that require more and more time. However, we believe that the papers we have received have covered a wide array of topics that are relevant to the issues with which archaeological research in Central and Southeast Europe is confronted. The authors are from Romania, Hungary, Serbia, Bulgaria and Poland and all are very familiar with the current issues that archaeology faces in their countries.

The historical time period was not chosen randomly; it reflects the birth, evolution and end of certain cultural and historical realities and the evolution of certain ceramic styles. This period covers the birth of the Cernavodă III-Boleráz world and its “descendants”, the Baden and Coțofeni cultures, and the cultural groups that derive from them.

Interest in the Baden culture has by far been the most constant, having produced both studies and researchers;¹ the same cannot be said of the contemporary, eastern manifestations. Meanwhile, the Coțofeni culture, which over past decades came to be regarded by most Romanian scholars as having been sufficiently explored, even a redundant ubiquity, has more recently proven to be more complex; today it is clear that it needs to be redefined and integrated in the

¹ Bronislav Chropovský, ed., *Symposium über die Entstehung und Chronologie der Badener Kultur* (Bratislava: Slowakische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1973); Martin Furholt et al., eds, *The Baden Complex and the Outside World. Proceedings of the 12th Annual Meeting of the EAA in Cracow 19-24th September, 2006*, SAO/SPEŠ 4 (Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, 2008); Martin Furholt, *Die nördlichen Badener Keramikstile im Kontext des mitteleuropäischen Spätneolithikums (3650-2900 v. Chr.)*, SAO/SPEŠ 3 (Bonn, Rudolf Habelt, 2009); Claudia Sachsse, *Untersuchungen zu den Bestattungssitten der Badener Kultur*, UPA 179 (Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, 2010); Tünde Horváth, *Networks and Netwars: New Perspectives on the Late Copper Age and Early Bronze Age. Typo-chronological Relationships of the Boleráz/Baden/Kostolac Finds at the Site of Balatonőszöd-Temetői dűlő, Hungary*, BAR, International Series 2427 (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2012); Tünde Horváth, ed., *The Prehistoric Settlement at Balatonőszöd-Temetői-dűlő. The Middle Copper Age, Late Copper Age and Early Bronze Age Occupations*, VAH XXIX (Budapest: Archeolingua, 2014); Marek Nowak and Albert Zastawny, eds, *The Baden Culture Around the Western Carpathians*, Via Archaeologica - Special Edition (Krakow: Institute of Archaeology of the Jagellonian University, Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology Polish Academy of Sciences, Kraków Branch, Archaeological Museum in Kraków, 2015).

world to which it belongs. Therefore, a small revolution is necessary in order to change perceptions regarding this cultural phenomenon, which has been unjustly marginalised in current historiography. This need is driven both by the stupendous number of discoveries and the consistent lack of preoccupation with the subject by the majority of contemporary scholars in the field. Petre Roman's study, conducted so many years ago,² is still the primary reference work, while Horia Ciugudean's more recent work³ has proven to be incomplete and an insufficient basis for understanding the entire array of discoveries. This state of things cements the status Petre Roman's study has as a fundamental monograph, although four decades have passed since its publication. Roman and Némethi's study of the Baden culture Romania poses a similar problem: its approaches still follow the only existing monograph, which was also published in 1978.⁴

Among the thematic volumes covering discoveries from this period made north of the Danube, the only noteworthy Romanian contribution from the last decades is a 2001 study of the Cernavodă III-Boleráz cultural complex, edited by Petre Roman and Saviana Diamandi.⁵ Other thematic multi-author collections have approached the historical region that is the focus of this edition of *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica*, but with few direct contributions.⁶

The present volume contains 14 contributions, organised in two parts: studies and *fontes*. In order to facilitate better circulation of information, the majority of the studies are in English. Although some contributions are slightly outside the temporal frame of this volume's theme, these provide context for the periods immediately before and after the primary phenomena we are focusing on.

The contributions begin with "The Romanian paradigm: Transylvania and the issue of Indo-Europeanization" [*Paradigma românească: Transilvania și problema indo-europenizării*], by Florin Gogâltan (Cluj-Napoca). It offers a consistent and useful retrospective on the Indo-European issue, as reflected in Romanian archaeological and historical research, emphasising its impact on the

² Petre I. Roman, *Cultura Coțofeni* [The Coțofeni Culture] BA XXVI (Bucharest: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1976).

³ Horia Ciugudean, *Eneolithic final în Transilvania și Banat: cultura Coțofeni* [The Late Eneolithic in Transylvania and Banat: The Coțofeni Culture], BHAB XXVI (Timișoara: Editura Mirton, 2000).

⁴ Petre I. Roman and Ioan Némethi, *Cultura Baden în România* [The Baden Culture in Romania], BA XXXI (Bucharest: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1978).

⁵ Petre Roman and Saviana Diamandi, eds, *Cernavodă III-Boleráz. Ein Vorgeschichtliches Phänomen zwischen dem oberrhein und der Unteren Donau. Symposium Mangalia/Neptun (18.-24. Oktober 1999)*, Studia Danubiana, Series Symposia II (Bucharest: Internationale Beratungskommission für die Förderung der Indo-Europäischen und Thrakischen Forschung, 2001).

⁶ Ioanna Galanaki et al., eds, *Between the Aegean and Baltic Seas. Prehistory across Borders*, *Aegeum* 27 (Liège: Université de Liège, 2007); Bernhard Hänsel and Wolfram Schier, eds, *The Neolithic and Eneolithic in Southeastern Europe. New Approaches to Dating and the Dynamics in the 6th to 4th Millennium BC*, PAS 28 (Berlin: Verlag Marie Leidorf GmbH, Rahden/Westf., 2014).

discourses of generations of Romanian scholars from the last century. This study approaches the realities of the Indo-European paradigm in Eastern Europe, an area in which publications - not only in archaeology, but also history and linguistics - were dominated by the ideologies of nationalism and communism.

Lolita Nikolova (Salt Lake City) addresses a unique issue in historical anthropology that involves both archaeology and genealogy: *Was Genealogy a Powerful Cultural Construct in Prehistory?* Focusing on the beginning of the Bronze Age in the Balkans, she approaches ancient genealogy through the possibility of corroborating ¹⁴C data dates indicated by the generically defined “cultural” changes to identify certain generations. Based on this analysis, the article examines the development of the concept of wealth in prehistory and the development social stratification in various parts of the Balkan-Carpathian region.

Tünde Horváth (Wien) offers an ample theme, not only in length, but also as a subject of debate: *4000-2000 BC in Hungary: The Age of Transformation*. The study is supported with numerous maps showing the continuity/discontinuity of the cultures in this period in what is now Hungarian territory. The central topic is the Baden culture’s important role in the dawn of the Bronze Age. The author concludes by arguing for the need to expand the conceptual language used in archaeological topology, from the limitations of discussing “cultures” and “complexes” to a more nuanced exploration of networks, in order to understand the interactions flows of influence in cultural groups of this period.

My article aims at establishing the relations between the Carpathian-Balkan and the Aegean-Anatolian regions: *Vessels for Toasting? The “Sauceboats” of the Coțofeni and Baden Cultures and their Balkan-Aegean Connections*. The so-called sauceboats have proven to be excellent biographical markers in reconstructing routes of developments in vessels used by wealthy elites in the late Eneolithic-early Bronze Age period. Based on a survey of published and unpublished finds, it was found that the oldest sauceboats known so far are from the Carpathian-Balkan region. Defining their precise use, that is, what they contained and how it was consumed, remains a current challenges in this field.

Two studies, one by Aleksandar Bulatović and Aleksandar Kapuran (Belgrade) and the other by Ion Tuțulescu (Râmnicu-Vâlcea), approach the issue of interactions between the Cernavodă III, Kostolac and Coțofeni cultures in southern Oltenia and the Central Balkans in the fourth millennium BC, as well as the relations between the Coțofeni culture from northern Oltenia and the Corded Ware culture.

A fresh perspective on Coțofeni finds in the Poiana Ruscă Mountains is offered by Cristian C. Roman and Sorin Tincu (Hunedoara). Their study presents discoveries, typological classifications and statistics obtained after researching the habitat and material culture of this territory.

PREFACE

In their study *Biały Potok Cemetery Revisited*, Przemysław Makarowicz and Marzena Szmyt (Poznań) offer a useful reassessment of discoveries made at a site in the Ternopil region of Ukraine and discoveries relating to the Eneolithic and the Bronze Age.

The second part of this volume, *Fontes*, contains works focusing on artefacts, the majority from recent archaeological digs: both salvage archaeology and systematic surveys.

Georgeta El Susi (Reșița, Bucharest) offers an archaeozoological analysis of a substantial batch of material extracted from a Tiszapolgár dwelling in the well-known Uivar-*Gomilă* site (in Câmpia Banatului). This analysis is used to establish kill-off patterns and metric assessments for both domestic and wild species.

A Ceramic Vessel from Bodrogkeresztúr Culture at Feldioara is basis of Zoltán Katocz's (Carei, Cluj-Napoca) comparative analysis of discoveries from the Eneolithic Feldioara site and items from the Carpathian Basin, focused on four-cornered-shaped vessels and the horizon to which they belong.

Ioan Al. Bărbat and Marius Gh. Barbu (Deva) present *A Late Eneolithic Tool Found at Tărtăria, Romania*, an in-depth analysis of a particular artefact and its analogues from the Eneolithic period. Their metallographic analyses shine a light on one of the few metal items from this period that has a high percentage of tin.

Some of the rich trove of discoveries from the prehistoric Cheile Turzii-*Peștera Binder* site in Romania are explored by Cornelia-Magda Lazarovici and Gheorghe Lazarovici. Their study *Atelierele de prelucrat bijuterii din Epoca cuprului* [Copper Age jewellery workshops] analyses the complex metallurgy activities that appear to have taken place within a prehistoric cave.

New data obtained from archaeological research of a rich Coțofeni dwelling at the base of Deva Fortress Hill (*Dealul Cetății*, Deva, Romania) is brought to light by Marius Gh. Barbu, Ioana L. Barbu and Antoniu T. Marc (Deva). Their discoveries are extremely interesting, containing complexes (some of which having specific purposes) and artefacts.

The final study, *A Copper Axe Discovered in Hărău (Hunedoara County)* by Cătălin N. Rîșcuța (Deva), offers a useful discussion on Faizs-type copper axes. Based on the discovery referred to in the title, the author proposes the need for a new definition of “varianta Hărău” [Hărău variant] axes.

I hope that the studies published in this volume can answer some of the questions that have been left unanswered by previous research on this period, and that they may open certain paths towards new discussions in the scholarly literature. I would like to thank my colleagues who answered the call for papers. They have my deepest gratitude.

THE EDITOR