AREA ORGANIZATION, ARRANGEMENT AND USE IN THE CUCUTENI, PHASE A CULTURE I

Dragomir Popovici

Rezumat

Studiul îşi propune să reanalizeze datele existente în publicaţiile monografice din punctul de vedere al organizării, amenajării şi utilizării spaţiului de către comunităţile cucuteniene ale fazei A În această primă parte sunt prezentate observaţiile ce au rezultat din studierea monografiilor publicate ale aşezărilor de la Hăbăşeşti şi Târpeşti, propunându-se noi ipoteze şi puncte de vedere, de natură să permită şi alte interpretări.

The Cucuteni Culture is the only prehistoric culture in Romania whose knowledge and understanding is based on several site monographs: Hăbăşeşti, Târpeşti and Truşeşti made by famous researchers, such as Vl. Dumitrescu, S. Marinescu-Bîlcu, M. Petrescu-Dîmboviţa, M. Florescu, A. C. Florescu. These monographs represent in an equal measure both the complete site investigations and also the monographic publishing of very important researches.

In a chronological order, we can thus mention the monographs of diggings at Cucuteni, Frumuşica, Izvoare, Drăguşeni, published by H. Schmidt, C. Matasă, R. Vulpe, S. Marinescu-Bîlcu, Al. Bolomey.

We must also add at these works some monographs dedicated to important aspects, such as the culture's fine arts – D. Monah, Cucuteni- B phase evolution - Şt. Cucoş, chronology - C.-M. Mantu, sites repertoires– D. Monah, Şt. Cucoş, D. N. Popovici.

Other categories of fundamental studies are due to Vl. Dumitrescu, H. Dumitrescu, M. Petrescu-Dîmboviţa, S. Marinescu-Bîlcu, S. Haimovici, Al Bolomey, etc.

Even though brief and incomplete, this enumeration is an eloquent argument for the data quality and quantity, hypotheses and demonstrations that allow us now an incomparable knowledge of this splendid civilization.

In the same time, the data accumulation and level of knowledge allow us and even impose new discussions and analyses that should allow a more complete discussion of problems and aspects previously impossible to be analyzed.

We want to re-discuss and re-analyze some of the problems concerning the area organization, arrangement and use by the Cucuteni Culture communities along the Romanian territory, especially during the Cucuteni A Phase.

Based on the performed researches and obtained data, the studies can advance with the double purpose of new and necessary re-evaluations and re-direction of future researches.

This is the motivation that justifies the current study.

We consider as significant the chronological succession of published monographs: Hăbăşeşti. Archaeological

monograph, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti, 1954; Târpeşti, B.A.R., I.S, 1981, Truşeşti, Editura Academiei, 1999 and Drăguşeni, 2000, (the latter proving in a very significant measure a characteristic research evolution at least in what regards the digging concept and technique, addressed problems and data interpretation); we shall thus follow the same steps in our analysis. The first proposes to insist on data resulted from the Hăbăşeşti and Târpeşti sites monographs.

Conceptual premises

In order to define these aspects we must first precise them. Thus, once accepted in a way or another, they become the base of larger analyses; with possible consequences in what regards the obtaining the more complete data sets. In the end, these contour the premises for adequate archaeological interpretation.

The social space (in our case the space of a settlement) can be considered in an important measure as being relevant for the expression of several behaviors and specific beliefs, both in their general and particular aspects. Their detailed study is the only compulsory condition that allows their necessary definition. The aim is to obtain the clearest underlying of the general aspects.

Between the analysis and spatial interpretation model used for this type of data sets and Rappoport`s model (two different models in what regard at least their evaluations and interpretations) we can observe the existence of integrating general conditions. These conditions include in a way or another the categories of problems subject of this paper (area organization, arrangement and use), analyzed at various scales (dwelling, settlement, wider area) (S.F. Cook, R.F. Heizer, 1968; J. Deetz, 1968; B.G.Trigger, 1968; idem 1972; Vl. Dumitrescu et al., 1983; A.Coudart, 1999; A.Rapoport, 1999; T. Jongsma, H. J. Greensfield, 2002).

The Hăbăşeşti settlement

Arguments

The archaeological monograph of the Cucutenian Hăbăşeşti settlement has a privileged place in the Romanian prehistoric historiography.

The moment of its appearance, the chronological unity between the moment of the diggings and the publishing of the results, the conception on the diggings and their quality are just a few arguments that ensure this exceptional monograph an important position among the Cucuteni culture historiography.

Last but not least, the qualities of the diggings and observations as well as the uprightness of expressed doubts and beliefs are arguments for the work's value. Thus, these become a solid starting base for further analysis and interpretations, which naturally proved necessary subsequent to the date of their publishing.

Methodological premises

The used data are those presented in the diggings` monograph. Their interpretation is often limited both by the conservation quality of the studied materials as well as by its original character. Under thus circumstances, the weight of most of the data has changed subsequently, due to gathering of new information.

It was for the first time when an entire settlement was totally dug and when the essential objective of the researches was the integral knowledge of the inhabiting level. The latter subject is the explanation for what drew the attention towards problems considered as very important, that were obviously resulted from the choice of the objectives. From this point of view, the analysis of building solutions, their typology, associations and, mainly, the spatial relations represent just means and not aim.

Most of the hypotheses initially presented have been subsequently confirmed. Other hypotheses appeared after

the completion and publishing of the researches from Hăbăşeşti.

We therefore must affirm from the very beginning that this fact induces a relative character to our observations, as these can be susceptible to questions when judged in detail. As it was impossible to have a higher certainty level for several data categories because of the remnants` conservation state or their lack of relevance at the moment of the field researches, in some cases we used indirect or inferred information. These made us try to define only the observations considered to have a more general character, without having absolute certitudes about them.

Area organization and arrangement

From the very beginning we want to focus our study on the general ratio between the built area and the total available area existing on the Holm (ratio between the built, antropised and natural areas).

We must make several preliminary specifications. It is difficult to reconstruct in high detail the built area of each dwelling erected above the ground surface. The difficulty lies in the fact that it often is very hard to make the difference between the built area and the area covered by the building's remnants. A higher safety coefficient is given by the buildings with a platform.

The computation of the underground built area (holes – or at least their upper part) might have altered the coefficient of antropication. So we decided that it is preferable not to add this category of data to our computation, otherwise the error risk might have been higher. From another point of view, our purpose has not been the extremely precise redefinition of the settlement's characteristics under their various aspects simply because we do not consider such thing as possible for the time being. This impossibility is due to the obvious fact that whole categories of data are missing from our analysis. The missing data refer mostly to the very probably existent other categories of buildings, such as barns, stables, yards, etc.

The usable area (or, at least, the one existing on the Holm height) had an area of about 2.5 ha. This area includes all the territory delimited by the defense trenches.

The minimal limit of the built space seems to have been of about 2.900 m², as we took into account only the area covered with buildings made on the ground, as resulted from the performed studies. Under such circumstances, the ratio between the available and built areas was of about 1:8, if we take into account all discovered buildings and we consider all of them as belonging to the same time period.

Several observations must be taken into account in order to attempt to have a closer to reality estimation. Based on the stratigraphic relations, we can observe the existence of at least 30% of the dwellings that are not contemporary at least between them (but we shall detail to this conclusion). Even more, other observations help us conclude that not all dwellings had been contemporary, as at least two – if not three - inhabiting levels were separated. If we subtract the estimated area of built structures that might have been built in the second sequence (about 30%), than the ratio might have been of about 1: 12,5. If we also admit as possible the percentage distribution of the buildings for each of the three sequences, than the ratio available/built area might have been of about 1: 25. This suggests that the available area inside the settlement was quite wide, representing a general antropication index that may be considered as characteristic for this settlement.

Since the publishing of the monograph, the dwellings` distribution according to a pre-existent model has been presumed. Thus, the proposed model was the circle, as the discovered dwellings appeared as grouped in two circles. This hypothesis was afterwards accepted by the greatest majority of the subsequent studies (Vl. Dumitrescu, 1954; idem, 1958a; idem, 1958b; idem, 1960; idem, 1963a; idem, 1963b; idem, 1974; Vl. Dumitrescu et al.,

1983; D. Monah, D. Popovici, 1985; L. Ellis, 1987; idem, 1996; V. A. Dergacev, 1993; V.Ja.Sorokin,1993; M.Petrescu-Dîmbovița,1993; C. M. Mantu, 1998; Marinescu-Bîlcu, S.,1998; D. Popovici, 2000; M. Petrescu-Dîmbovița, 2001; N. Ursulescu, 2002, p.26, that also presents the possibility of the dwellings` distribution in three rectangular groups).

Our detailed analysis is based on the author's statement that the settlement was not formed in only one – very first – moment. Even more, he considers that the settlement is the result of a gradual evolution, even though in a very short time interval that could not allow us to detect an evolution between the previously and lately built structures. This situation induced the analysis of all data categories as a whole. This stopped the detection of elements potentially capable to offer details or even significant evolutions.

If we consider this category of problems, the building and stratigraphic details become very important.

We therefore considered as relevant and tried to study the ratios between various built structures, either from those made on the ground or from the underground.

The settlement level

For the easier understanding of the proposed analysis, we present a synthesis of the data obtained during the researches.

The archaeological digging from the Holm allowed the study of 63 dwellings remnants, another one remaining not completely investigated.

The settlement also had two defense trenches (M.Petrescu-Dîmbovița, 1954, p.203 and following). As the performed stratigraphic observations did not allow the obtaining of sure data, the explanation was that these trenches nevertheless date back from the same period of the Cucuteni A Phase (ibidem, p.217; Vl. Dumitrescu, 1954, p.501-504). Thus, it was practically considered that these trenches were structured as a unitary, coherently defensive system.

Grouping the obtained data, observations made during the digging and the study of resulted materials, Vl. Dumitrescu wrote (Ibidem, 1954, p.199) that two dwellings` circles existed here. Thus, these circles appeared to be tangent one to the other and the tangent point was represented by dwelling no. 2.

The first circle might have been made of the structures grouped around dwelling no. 15 and the second of the structures grouped around dwelling no. 1. The author also considers that this might have been also the order of their building (ibidem, p.201). As a consequence, it is considered that a series of dwellings "*placed at the NW and W extremities of the settlement cannot be connected in any way to these circles…*" but even that they form "*a small circle, composed of the dwellings no. 35, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 44, and 40, having the center in dwelling no. 41"* (ibidem, p.199). This hypothesis can be considered as pushing the limits of reality, as it seems more probable that these represent dwellings subsequent to those composing the circle from the settlement's center (ibidem, p.201). We consider as certain that it was impossible to build all the inhabiting structures in the same time; thus their certain temporal sequence is presumed, even though it cannot be precisely established (ibidem, p.504). Even more, the fact that all built structures from this settlement were burnt can only strengthen the idea that these were not built all in the same time, as it is also obvious that there were differences between the various building times (it seems less possible that only a part of the existing dwellings were burnt, while others remained in use).

As we try to better understand the problems connected to the areal systemizing at the settlement's level and often the stratigraphic data cannot offer sufficiently precise details, two data categories may prove useful: those regarding the stratigraphic ratios between the different inhabited structures and the ratios between

the inhabiting structures and the elements composing the settlement's defensive system.

In the first case, the only element that may eventually bring in supplementary data is given by the ratio between the structures made on the ground and the underground structures. More in detail, this ratio is between built structures considered as houses and underground structures like holes; this ratio has been considered as eloquent ever since the moment of its publishing (Ibidem, 1954, p.504).

Therefore, we admit the existence of a previous-subsequent type ratio in the case of these overlapping. Thus, we shall be able to observe that in the case of about 21 built structures, i.e. about 33% of their total, there are overlapping of the house/hole type, that imply chronological differences of the building periods (the building structures taken into account contain houses and dependencies; had we taken into account only the houses overlapping holes, the number of built structures would have been 18, i.e.41%).

The conclusion that most of the studied holes had been dug for raw materials was explicitly stated also in the monograph (and we can thus only agree to it), therefore it is logical that they were made before the building of the dwellings. This seems obvious at least for a part of them, but for the time being it is extremely difficult to say for which. Also for the time being, it is hard to estimate the significance of the small number of dwellings considered as dependencies that might have overlapped holes: only 2, maximum 3. We may normally consider for this case a statistic possibility of their being built at the beginning of the inhabitance, even though this hypothesis is still very hard to be proved with high certainty. Anyway, with all uncertainty of these data, the statistical weight of either 33% or of 41% proves that a quite important number of the built structures were made subsequent to the first inhabiting sequence. This may prove as an important, more concrete, argument in the favor of successive inhabiting sequences.

If we take into account that other 4, possibly 6, buildings with platform had below them various archaeological remains that obviously did not seem to be intended deposits, then the number of dwellings built after the first inhabiting sequence is of 25 (probably 27). This represents a percentage of about 40% and may suggest a cert dynamics of the settlement.

From this point of view it is important to remember that materials have been discovered in at least 10 of the holes` fillings. These materials are daub fragments provenient from walls, platforms or burning structures (another four holes). This may be interpreted as proof of the existence of integrally or partially abandoned buildings, which, at their turn, can be interpreted as signs of a relatively important change in the settlement's areal structure. These observations may prove the existence of built structures that disappeared completely after their burning, while the area was probably re-used (when fragments of walls and platforms were found) or burnt structures were re-built (in the case of hearth fragments), even though no observation made during diggings allow us the latter supposition.

In what regards the holes` fillings, it must be remarked that generally these consisted of three layers (Ibidem, 1954, p.119, 148, etc.). The first two layers (in the depositional order) contained various remnants, while the third was attributed to a period subsequent to the end of the plateau's inhabitance.

We underline again that only four of the studied holes belonging to the Cucutenian period contained remnants belonging to abandoned hearth-like burning structures.

It is obvious that this fact shall not clarify the stratigraphic or chronologic connections between this first category (ground-built structures overlapping underground structures – holes) with the discoveries that do not belong to this

category. We can nevertheless accept that, statistically speaking, at least 30% of the dwellings might have been built sometimes after the first occupational moment on the Holm. This assumption can be accepted only if the holes had no functional relation with the over imposed dwellings (and this idea can be accepted as neither the holes` fills accept such an idea). We also mention that the data used for this statistics have not taken into account the (relatively numerous) situations when various remnants were discovered under platforms. These remnants were mainly pottery fragments probably randomly thrown away. The fragments, in association with observations according to whom the various holes` fillings also contained platform or hearth weldings, were probably provenient from abandoned dwellings due to fires.

If we try to make abstraction from the dwellings that overlap holes (that represent subsequent moments) and try to see the potential consequences of this situation in what regards the areal distribution, it must be remarked that the circular distribution is no longer obvious. Thus, the areal distribution is probably closer to groups of dwellings disposed in „nests".

If the before mentioned idea is true, it is then interesting that in this moment of the inhabitance the area opposed to the defense trench has a lower concentration of dwellings. Thus, we may suppose that this area might have been reserved to animals or to common, maybe public, activities.

Level of built structures

We included in this category all dwellings made on the ground, trying that at least for the beginning to pay no attention to existing classifications, as we want to return to this topic towards the end of our analysis.

Building solutions

We shall try to analyze as much as possible the characteristic building elements in order to outline their weigh in the general frame of the settlement.

A long – time debate, started since the beginning of researches performed both in the Cucutenian as well as Tripolian areas, has been the problem of the characteristic platforms. The results of these debates have brought to light many aspects that are not dealt with in this study (see also the discussion of various aspects by Vl. Dumitrescu, 1954, p. 18 and following; I. T., Dragomir, 1962; Vl. Dumitrescu, 1968; I.Paul, 1967; A. Laszlo, 1988; S. Marinescu-Bîlcu, Al. Bolomey, 2000).

We observe in the case of the Holm settlement the statistic importance of dwellings with platform. Thus, a number of 40 dwellings (63.50% of the total number of dwellings) have an integral platform. Another two (3% of the remaining dwellings) seem to have had a partial platform. Thus, 21 dwellings (30% of the total number) had no platform at all. We can thus observe that the general feature of the dwellings from this settlement was the presence of the platform.

Area arrangement of built structures

An interesting situation was observed in the case of the dwellings that might have had separation walls. This could have been discussed together with the building solutions, but we incline to present it here, as it may thus be more expressive for our analysis.

The probable existence of separation walls is presumed in 13 dwellings, i.e. about 21% of the total number. We consider significant that all these 13 dwellings have a platform. Out of these 13, only three had a hearth and an oven (i.e. about 23%), one had only an oven (i.e. 8%), **while the other nine (about 69%)** had only hearths. Still only three out of these (dwellings no. 15, 26, 32) have remnants of such walls that seem to have been oriented parallel to the dwellings` axis (Vl. Dumitrescu, 1954, p. 75-78; 110-111; 128-129). This represents an absolute novelty till the present time. The area of dwelling no. 26 (smaller than 30 m²) is surprising, as all the others had more than 100 m².

In what regards their area, the dwellings that might have had separation walls can be divided into three classes: three with areas of including 40 m² , other four between 40 and 60 m² inclusive, while four between 60 and 120 m² (an equal percentage distribution).

Other facilities, such as verandahs, were probably observed just in the case of two dwellings, both with a platform. The percentage is thus of 3% (5% among the dwellings with a platform). An extremely low weight of also his facility is observed.

In what regards the burning structures, either ovens or hearths, we can mention the following situation:

-dwellings only with hearths: 23 (a percent of 36,50% of the total number of dwellings, or about 62% of the total number of supposed houses);

-dwellings with ovens: 7, representing thus about 11% (out of the total number of dwellings, as the percent out of the total number of houses is about 20%);

-dwellings with both ovens and hearths: 7, therefore 7% of the total number and about 20% of the number of houses.

We must thus notice the relatively high frequency of dwellings with hearths, another characteristic of the settlement from the Holm.

Ovens and oven-hearth associations represent not very diffuse options for the dwellings` inner fitting.

We also studied the statistic distribution of the presence of hearths (built directly on the ground, by interrupting the platform in the case of dwellings with platforms) in various dwellings and the distributions of various existing possible associations (only grinders, grinder/hearth, grinder/oven, grinder/hearth/oven). We mention that, in order to diminish the error risk, we used several computation bases: number of dwellings with grinders, their total number, total number of dwellings with platform and of dwellings with separation walls.

Grinders were discovered in 21 dwellings; this represent about 30% of the total and about 50% of the dwellings with platform. Only two of the dwellings with separation walls contained grinders.

The grinder/hearth association seems the characteristic option for the Cucutenian community from the Holm. This situation was observed in 65% of the dwellings with grinders (= about 24% of the total number of dwellings and 38% of the dwellings with platform). About 46% of the dwellings with separation walls contained the grinder/hearth association.

The grinder/oven association represents about 17% of the dwellings with grinders, about 6% of the total and 10% of the dwellings with platform. Only one dwelling with separation walls contained this association.

A low frequency was the case of grinder/hearth/oven: about 9% of the dwellings with grinders, about 3% of the total, 5% of the dwellings with platform and about 7% of the dwellings with separation walls.

It must therefore be remarked that in the case of built structures with grinders (about a third of the total) the characteristic, representative category is grinder/hearth association, even though it has only 20% of the settlement's general frame.

In the monograph about the archaeological diggings in the Cucutenian settlement on the Holm, two categories were separated for the built structures: houses and annexes. The considered criteria were: the built area, observable spatial relations (closeness to dwellings considered as houses) and, secondarily, other arguments such as inventory, fittings, etc.

In what regards the annexes, the area criterion allows the following differentiation for the 19 such structures:

- 7 had an area up to 10 m² (inclusive);

- 9 of them had an area of up to 29 m² inclusive;

- 3 had areas of 30 m² and above.

Two, possibly four of them had a total platform. Hole-overlapped-by- dwelling stratigraphic situations were observed only in two, possibly three cases, where two exceeded areas of 30 m² and only one with a platform. We must remark that none of these had burning structures.

Burning structures such as hearths and ovens existed in only four such buildings. No hearth/oven, neither hearth/grinder nor oven/grinder associations were discovered; one grinder was nevertheless discovered.

In what regards the area/internal fitting relation, we remark that oven-type burning structures were discovered only in wider dwellings (areas between 16 and 30 m²).

Dwelling numbered 21a2 has a special situation. This has neither burning structure nor a total or partial platform. In exchange, the adornment objects deposit was discovered here (Ibidem, 1954, p.435-456; idem, 1957, passim). This situation seems hard to be interpreted, at least for the time being.

We believe that all the previously mentioned facts are suggestive enough to affirm that most of the dwellings described before were fitted and consequently had a specific use different to the one of the houses.

Land use

The differentiated use of the dwellings` inner areas is a constant remark for all the studied discoveries. Thus, in most of the cases, we must remark the differentiate positioning of burning structures and grinders. Logically, the burning structures, grinders and supply jars were placed by the walls, the preferred associations being hearths/ovens and supply jars, while the grinders had a different position.

In many cases, the pots and jars were stocked outside the dwellings.

Dwellings without burning structures seem to have been the so-called appendix structures, used for at least some of the daily domestic activities.

When we try to understand the evolution time frame of the Cucuteni community from the Holm, several data categories must be taken into account.

In the case of dwellings with platforms, we must underline a category of observations that may have a higher relevance. We refer here to the existence of weldings/reconstructions of platforms or walls. Thus, only one welding layer was found in the case of 22 dwellings (about 55%), while several welding layers were found for only one dwelling (No. 33)

In what regards the hearth-like burning structures (found in 27 dwellings), data about their active part thickness exist only in 13 dwellings.

Using this criterion (thickness of the active part), we observe that 6 such structures had a thickness of up to 2 cm (Nos. 29, 31, 32, 33, 39 and 41), i.e. about 20% of the total number of built structures with hearths and about 46% of the units from where we could gather information. Two have a thickness comprised between 2 and 3 centimeters (dwellings 18 and 34), i.e. 7% of the total and about 15% of the dwellings that supplied information. 4 had a thickness of 3-4 cm. (dwellings no. 14, 20, 23, 25), weighing about 15% of the total and about 30% of the measurable ones. In only one case the thickness of the active part was of 4.5 cm (4% of the total and about 8%, respectively).

Of course, the statistic data for this case are subject to a certain frailty. We nevertheless consider that they may offer at least suggestions about the building solutions and time range for the hearths` use. We remark and consider significant the important number of hearth with an active part thickness of less than 2 cm. This feature was also considered as characteristic by Vl. Dumitrescu.

If we associate the first two classes (thickness of the active part up to 3 cm) we observe that they consist of the majority of the hearths (8 out of 13 with known data).

This suggests that the use of thinner active parts was a general building solution. The hearths with active parts are only 5 out of the total.

We must mention that the hearth of dwelling 38 (ibidem, p.153) has a peculiar thickness of the active part. This must be interpreted as a building, not a temporal, aspect.

We believe as more important the remnants of dwellings no. 25 and 44 (Ibidem, 1954, p. 101-103, 170-174), with mentioned restorations. It is important to mention that these dwellings contain two building stages (or eventual restorations on the same position) very probably coinciding to sequences of the Cucutenian inhabitance on the Holm. We can also remark that a hearth was not covered by the second phase platform but re-used by subsequent restoration. In other words, their building sequences represent two dwellings` building sequences (occupational phases). This means re-use completed by restoration. This fact seems important as, under such conditions, all Cucutenian Hearth-like burning structures knew using periods that coincide to those of the buildings` use. These periods do not seem very long; no restorations were made during the same inhabitance time frame.

Based on observations made on the Borduşani-Popină archaeological site, Ialomița County during the experimental archaeology program developed here during the past years, we can add that the burning of hearth walls for the first 2 – 3 cm. in thickness are representative for use periods of at most several years.

We can add to all the observation regarding the holes` filling. As it can be remarked ever since the researches` publishing and stratification moment, it has a unitary structure. Data about this structure suggests its relatively fast filling, completed by the observation that most of the holes had, at their upper part, a layer of ground that covered its unfilled part as remained from the Cucutenian inhabitance. (Ibidem, 1954, p. 198 and following).

Even though we do not have the certitude of the precise reconstruction of many details, their relative concordance makes us believe that we quite credibly accept the theory of a not very long inhabitance. Nevertheless, this was characterized by a probable and sustained building activity. This conclusion is sampled by the 10 holes` fillings (about 12% of the total) contained by big daub fragments, from walls and mainly from platforms. From our point of view these are more relevant than the 4 holes (about 5%) that contained hearth remnants, as the latter can eventually mark punctual reconstruction-repairing of the burning structures.

Even though we do not take into account their chronological value, we consider as significant the general observation that suggests a relatively short period of use for these buildings during the Cucutenian inhabitance.

The inexistence of specific activity zones is an important problem. If no workshop-like structures were certainly observed, two other situations must be mentioned. The only probable exception for these activity zones is dwelling 22, that can eventually be put in relation with a possible flint workshop; the results of the work being nevertheless used only by the inhabitants of the dwelling, taking into account only the raw material (ibidem, p.96 and following). The 32 and 36 dwellings contained a higher than usual number of grinders (ibidem, p.128-129 was it is expressly mentioned that *"...maybe more than in any other dwelling..."* and p.144-148).

In dwelling 36 four grinders seem to have been moved to a part of the building without platform. This area covered about 1/3 of the whole and grouped most of the pottery fragments; also *Triticum compactum* and *Vicia vilosa* seeds were discovered here. Two hearths and other inventory pieces were discovered in the platform area, twice as big as the previous one.

At its turn, dwelling no. 32 contained the biggest number of grinders discovered in the Holm settlement. This situation made the

researcher say that these *"... proved a thrifty area (or room) ...",* but who (we add) seem to overstep the frame of a simple built structure.

Dwelling no. 33 presents a different situation as it contained four hearths, out of which three were positioned along the Southern wall, while the fourth was built near the Northern wall (ibidem, p.131-132).

Hole No. 36, whose fill (that contained many statuettes) was also connected to the probable existence of such a shop, craftsman? –ibidem, p. 73).

The before mentioned observations, even though not very conclusive can anyway suggest the existence of areas where very possibly specific activities that needed a certain specialization were performed. For the moment it is difficult to compute their weight and especially their role for their entire community.

Final observations

In conclusion, we believe that the analysis we tried to develop allows (even though with an extent of uncertainty) several observations that try to underline somewhat more general situations.

Area structuring

In what regards the area structuring, we mention:

-the existence of a certain structuring of the inhabited area in the shape of at least two circles of dwellings seems to us as less probable;

-the inhabitance evolution in this place seems to have been marked more by the dwellings` distribution in *"nests"* with a variable number of buildings. The higher or lower number of dwellings was related to the number of members or, more probably, generations composing the families (thus implying their successive building);

- the building of the second defensive system, not on the same place with the first, marks the community's decision (imposed by the change of several conditions) to increase the protected area in order to satisfy higher needs (protection of a bigger number of animals, increase in the number of inhabitants, etc.) or to prevent external pressure factors that are difficult to estimate.

The area arrangement:

-the distinction between buildings considered as houses and appendixes, as resulted from the built area or building techniques, risk not to integrally correspond to reality; nevertheless their positions and typo-dimensional associations lead towards the existence of structures with different or complementary functions. These structures were regrouped in areal units with more buildings;

-the existence of only (probably) two dwellings with partial platforms may be explained either by the deliberate choice of such dwellings (with differences in the inner space building; implying thus it's differentiate use) or by their completion in two successive moments but with different use. Whatever their chronology, we can conclude that this situation is not common for the Holm settlement;

-most probable dwelling shape for the Holm settlement seems to have been the dwelling with a platform and only one burning structure; more frequent is the inner placed (or in an appendix building) hearth. It is difficult, at least for the time being, to find explanations for these differences;

-positions of various structures such as hearths, ovens, grinders, groups of supply jars, suggest the deliberate distribution in areas dedicated to specific activities; the areal separation of grinders from burning structures and the association of supply jars with burning structures and not grinders are significant;

-the existence of at least two (maximum three) inhabiting sequences allows their association with the completion of a defense system for each sequence. The defense system consisted of the trench very probably associated to a palisade (without whom it might not have been very useful).

Area use

-at the settlement's level it is most probable that during the Holm's first inhabiting sequence a wider area was spared in the part opposite to the one protected by the defense system. This system seems subsequently abandoned in the favor of wider areas around the houses corresponding to families with more generations (generally bigger households);

-the presented data about the area organization and distribution suggest the probable existence of two use categories. The first copes with the different use of dwellings that can be called houses and appendixes. The second considers the dwellings` inner space structuring and mainly use, especially for houses. This category seems to be diffuse, less segregated than in the first category;

-a last observation must be made, even though it is difficult to affirm its exact significance, at least for the moment: greatest majority of the hearths discovered in the Holm settlement were disturbed by subsequent interventions (Ibidem, 1954, p.38); there are nevertheless no data proving that the interventions were made in other periods. Thus, we may conclude that the interventions were made immediately after the burning of the houses. This suggests a potential behavior about which we do not know how general it was. A special, detailed discussion shall be needed if this observation is confirmed also in other Cucutenian settlements;

-data resulting from the monograph do not allow us to affirm the existence of a settlement with a high polarity degree (special buildings, workshops, sanctuaries, etc.). As a consequence, it is harder to admit that the defense system was made according to a pre-existing plan; we believe as more probable that it might have been with the purpose to offer resistance in front of an impending danger. An argument is the fact that the first defense trench was abandoned at a certain moment, a second being subsequently built. A more probable idea is that the first defense structure was not efficient, a proof being the remnants of burnt houses. The plateau was subsequently inhabited, very probably after a very brief period of time, but not necessarily by the same community. A potential proof is the intended destruction of the burning structures after each inhabitance sequence (as all have this common feature). We may thus admit that the inhabitance was re-started each time either by the same community or by communities with identical or resembling behaviors;

-another observation that suggests the possible existence of a different behavior type is the discovery of various archaeological remnants under several dwelling platforms. At least for some of them we can question whether they were deliberately placed beneath the platform. The lack of observations of the same type in the case of dwellings without platform does impede our advance in this direction.

We consider the before-mentioned observations as extremely important, at least in what regards their consequences. The very precise measurement of details about the area structuring, arrangement and use presumes the existence of one or more conceptions that, at their turn(s), generate adequate digging techniques and consequences about the occupational levels (including also their duration). The consequences of the various categories of objects` analysis are obvious. The desired result is the potential deciphering of several general and particular features of the social systems (whose filtered, selected expression are the remnants discovered during the diggings).

We nevertheless remark the scarcity of relevant information for the types and intensities of intra-settlement systems` behaviors. This expressively marks the current analysis level and, thus, the intra- and inter-cultural behaviors.

We consider as significant the consequences regarding the definition of regional or local aspects (also see about this subject Vl. Dumitrescu, 1974; idem, 1976; S. Marinescu-Bîlcu, 1989; S. Marinescu-

Bîlcu, Al. Bolomey, 2000; D. Boghian, 2001), of successions analyzed both culturally and chronologically. Last but not least, we must reconsider the aspects about the resources management and demographic estimations (R.Naroll, 1962; S. LeBlanc, 1971; P.Wiessner, 1974).

It is obvious that this analysis must be continued also for other settlements, so that it may define each settlement's characteristic (and eventually individual) elements. On this basis we shall further be able to more precisely define the areal and regional aspects and, this, the causes that induced their differentiated evolution.

Târpeşti-
Râpa lui Bodai Settlement

The analysis of the data resulted from the published monographs are justified for a number of reasons. The most important reasons are: quality of the digging, information level, conceptual unity between the two monographs and the model proposed for the area organization, arrangement and use.

The archaeological researches from Tîrpeşti proved the existence of a multilayered settlement, with occupational levels attributed to more epochs and cultures (S. Marinescu-Bîlcu, 1981, p. 3 and following). The following lines present only the remnants belonging to the Cucuteni A Phase.

Cucuteni A level consisted of the remnants of 17 built structures, assimilated to houses, a defense trench that partly overlapped a previous one, dug by the Precucutenian community (Phase III). The trench was positioned towards the settlement's Northern and North-western limits with a length of 129 m. and a depth of 1.2 – 1.75 m. in comparison with the digging level. Its upper part had an opening between 2 and 5 m. This structure protected an area of about 4.600 m². Computations estimated that the digging of the trench excavated over 600 m³ of earth (S. Marinescu-Bîlcu, 1981, p.50). The problem discussed also in this case regarded the subsequent use of excavated earth (building of the dwellings?) and the very probable existence of a palisade that may have doubled the defense trench, placed on its inner side, towards the dwelling (S. Marinescu-Bîlcu, 1981, p. 50-51).

The study of the diggings` general plan (Ibidem, 1981, Fig. 3) quite clearly proves that the dwellings` disposition was not made according to an already existing plan (the built structures` *"random disposition "* being even a hypothesis made at a certain level of the researches but subsequently abandoned – see also comments in Ibidem, 1981, p.51). An argument may be the digging of the defense trench. The building of four houses outside the protected perimeter proves that this activity took place after the abandoning of the trench as a defensive structure. As a consequence, the formation of the dwellings` circle was finalized only during the last inhabiting period and subsequent to the functioning period of the defensive trench.

We believe that this is also a possible explanation for the non-observation of other defensive elements (such as walls or palisades, that eventually might have completed the settlement's defensive system), as it is obvious that these were abandoned in order to allow the completion of the already mentioned buildings.

Area organization and arrangement

The settlement level

One of the features of the research is that in most of the cases the conservation level of built structures was precarious mainly due to sometimes ample subsequent disturbances. Sometimes, another cause is the impossibility of their integral digging. Thus, if we take into account the before mentioned arguments, we shall observe that most of the observations are limited and this fact seriously affects the conclusions. Nevertheless, the accuracy of field research and the analysis of various data categories

inserted in the scientific circuit by their monographic publishing sometimes allow new analyses. These analyses help several aspects to become visible, as significant data multiply.

The organization at the general settlement level is an important problem. Many details must be clarified in order to define (or at least to try) the characteristic types of area structuring: relations between the built and inhabited/used areas on the basis of eventual stratigraphic and implicitly chronologic relations between the various dwellings.

One of the first problems that must be thus analyzed is the very precise establishing of eventual areal, stratigraphic (and therefore chronologic) relations existing between the defense trench and all the other studied dwellings from the settlement.

Thus, we obtained the following conclusions after a first level of observations:

-it can be certainly affirmed that at least two inhabitance sequences existed. This conclusion is based on the fact that the defensive structure divides the settlement in two areas (dwellings placed in the protected and not protected areas). As a consequence, we can a priori group the dwellings protected by the trench into the first area and those not protected in the second. We can logically presume that the second category represents dwellings built after the abandonment of the trench;

-the lack of stratigraphic specifications impedes a more precise establishment of chronological relations between the built structures from this settlement. This means that our ideas shall be only relative and in accordance with the conclusions emitted by the author of the diggings. Anyway, the dwellings built outside the defense system are an argument that, during their building, some of the dwellings from the first category were still very probably used. Otherwise, the position of the dwellings outside the defense trench cannot be explained;

-we can admit as a principle that the structures built outside the area protected by the defense trench might have been contemporary (or at least partially, even though there might have been very brief time intervals between them). This inhabitance level seems not have taken a very long time; an eventual argument is small number of dwellings;

-under these circumstances we can observe that the minimum area belonging to the first phase was of about 534 m² while the newly built area for the second was of about 283 m². In this case, the minimum total area from this phase might have been of about 817 m². The total used area in the first phase was of about 0.5 ha., while in the second phase it might have been of about 0.8 ha. Without a maximum certainty, we may hypothetically admit that in the first phase the ratio between the totally used and built areas was of about 9:1, while in the second it could have been 28:1. If we take into account the total area and the number of dwellings, this ratio might have had the value of 10:1.

Trying to understand as precise as possible the dwelling's general evolution in the existing area, we tried to check and correlate these observations with data offered by the definition of pottery complexes from the studied built structures.

We thus observed that Cucuteni A1 stage comprised structures numbered with nos. 5, 10, 15, 20 bis and 24, to Cucuteni A1-A2 stage – the structures no. 1 and 11 while Cucuteni A2 stage contains structures numbered with no. 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23.

The statistical definition of pottery complexes belonging to each built structure (if stylistic sequence have a temporal value) suggests the possible existence of at least three inhabitance sequences at the Râpa lui Bodai.

The first might have been characterized by the five studied structures belonging to Cucuteni A1 stage (about 30 % of the total number of dwellings).

The second category has a statistical weight of about 12% of the total and might contain two structures characteristic to the A1-A2 sequence.

The third, with ten built structures, might have had at its turn a statistic weight of about 59 %. This situation may apparently demonstrate that the intensity of the inhabitance was concentrated during the Cucuteni A2 stage.

But if we accept in the following lines the existence of at least three inhabiting levels (as resulted from the definition of pottery complexes), the analysis of their areal dispersal based on the defense trench existence and use proves inadvertences that throw a doubt on one, or the other, or even both the used criteria.

We observe thus that:

- The built structures attributed to the Cucuteni A1 stage (on the basis of pottery complexes) are randomly distributed, relatively far from one to another. Two of them (no. 10 and 20bis) were – or might have been considered as – subsequent to the completion of the defense trench;

-the two dwellings belonging to the Cucuteni A1-A2 stage, no. 1 and 11, respectively, are also randomly placed. No. 11 is positioned towards the Southern limit of the area while No. 1 in approximately in the center of the inhabited area;

-the situation is more complicated in the case of buildings belonging to the Cucuteni A2 stage (still using the pottery complex). We observe that dwellings no. 9 and 20 are placed outside the perimeter that may, in principle, be attributed to the first phase, but may also, in the same time, be contemporary to dwellings no. 10 and 20bis (attributed to stage Cucuteni A1);

-in what regards the dwellings` positioning in relation with the defense trench, we must also note that the built structures no. 10, 9, 20 and 18 (and we may also add nos. 13 and 20bis) are much too close to the trench and therefore they may not have been its contemporaries, as their positioning might have cancelled the defense role of the trench. From the published plans of dwellings No. 10 and 18, even though no data are presented about their relations with the defense trench, we can consider them as very close or even affected by the trench, according to observations made on the general plan containing the built structures. It may thus result that both these dwellings might have been disturbed by the trench digging. If, in the case of dwelling 18, this situation is not embarrassing, as it is in the inner part of the protected area (and may be thus considered as previous to the building of the defense system), the situation of dwelling no. 10 is more complicated. This dwelling is placed outside the protected area and may force us to conclude that it is subsequent to the completion of the defense system or, even at limit, subsequent to its both completion and use. If this observation, correlated to the attribution of dwelling no. 20bis to the Cucuteni A1 stage, is correct, than the settlement's areal structure is fundamentally altered. The reason of this presumption is that during the Cucuteni A1 stage the settlement must have had a much wider area and the dwellings` distribution might have eventually resembled to the U letter. The consequences of the interpretations (especially if we try to find out more precisely when the defense trench was dug) may be of some importance, as the Cucuteni A1-A2 inhabitance level may be excluded. This conclusion is drawn as if the dwellings attributed to this inhabitance level are placed inside the protected area, they are too few to explain the completion of such a sophisticated logistic system. A supplementary argument that may be taken into account is the position of dwelling no. 10, belonging to the Cucuteni A1 stage. This dwelling is „cut" by the defense trench trajectory and is thus previous to its digging (as resulted from the general and especially detailed plans -Ibidem, 1981, fig.3; fig.125).

Therefore, the only moment when the defense trench might have been dug is only during the Cucuteni A2 stage, nevertheless at some time after the building of at least some (or even of all) buildings. The trench

may thus also be subsequent to the abandoning of dwellings no. 9 and 20, as after its completion, these may have been left outside the protected area. This observation may be also sustained by the fact that it is very possible (on the basis of the published plan, Ibidem, 1981, fig.3), that also dwelling no. 18 (attributed to Cucuteni A2 stage) may have been previous to the digging of the defense trench.

At this level of data interpretation attempt (as resulted from the areal analysis of existing data in the settlement from Râpa lui Bodai) we believe that it is possible to make several statements affirming observations with some importance.

1. The existence of a pre-existent plan for the areal distribution of built structures in the shape of a circle becomes improbable, especially if we take into account the fact that here certainly were several inhabitance sequences (even though these can not be certainly determined at the time being).

2. The correlation of results of analyses made on the basis of various criteria seems irrelevant. We specially refer to the definition of pottery complexes and areal analysis. Fine stratigraphy data may have probably been more useful.

3. On the contrary, we find as very important the very precise computation of the exact time of the trench digging as it was thus possible to underline several valuable data:

-if the defense trench had been dug in one of the inhabiting sequences previous to the end of the Cucutenian inhabitance and was relatively quickly abandoned, this might have meant the proof of a danger (the trench was thus made to protect the community from this danger). Once the danger over, the trench must have been abandoned and the settlement continued its normal evolution. But the existence of burnt dwellings may represent the argument proving that the inhabitance here was ended by a conflict;

-under such circumstances it seems probable that the completion of the defense system (digging of the trench) was made with the purpose to protect the community from an already manifested danger (see situation of at least dwellings no. 10 and 18). This danger had already proved in consisting of the burning of dwellings. Nevertheless it seems that danger was not avoided (just that the following time the entire settlement was definitively burnt down);

-a last important observation is that none of this settlement's visible attributes (as resulted from the performed studies) nor the inhabiting sequences succession cannot allow us conclude that the Cucutenian settlement might have been highly polarized. The settlement's high polarity is the only one that might have justified the completion of a defense structure from the very beginning and during the entire life of the Cucutenian settlement.

Nevertheless, there is a higher probability that under such circumstances the built structures might have been grouped around several first dwellings or around dwellings belonging to several families. Around these initial dwellings, dependencies and other homes belonging to the next generations were made. This idea confirms the initial theory.

This entire attempt to order the information may be considered as acceptable (or at least some of its aspects) if a certain type of relations between the dwellings` pottery complexes and their time value is accepted as possible.

If, in exchange, these pottery complexes were correctly determined (i.e. they were even partially contemporary), than the idea about the two sequences marked by the defense trench is almost zero, as their attributes are not integrally known (see also Ibidem, 1981, p.1); nevertheless, the existence of two occupational levels remain certain. We add this idea as all studied complexes were burnt and under these circumstances we can presume that both inhabiting sequences ended violently. The lack of relevant data based on the precise identification of all elements, makes practically impossible the identification of each sequence's dwelling in relation with the defense trench. It is though nevertheless

logically unacceptable that the second sequence consisted only of dwellings built outside the defense trench.

Level of built structures

In this study we preferred to use the term „built structure" as the Romanian archaeological references contains two terms (house/dwelling and appendix) that refer mainly to their functionality; the separation between them is mostly made on the basis of only one argument, the area, that cannot always constitute a sure criterion. Not willing to use terms that cannot be always proved by the discoveries, we shall use the term „built structure". We use dwelling or appendix only if we are absolutely sure about the structure's function. We shall try to clarify our option in the following lines.

Our attempt to define these complexes' characteristics aimed at the underlying of all detectable attributes.

Building solutions

One of the criteria that can be seen as relevant is the existence of a platform made of wood and clay. The situation from the Râpa lui Bodai settlement shows that only two built structures had a platform made for the entire built area (no. 12 and no. 18). Other two dwellings had a partial platform (no. 15 and 21), meaning about 12% of all the built structures or about 24% of the structures with either a total or partial platform. This observation seems to cancel the argument of the platform as a characteristic functional criterion, as most of the built structures from the Râpa lui Bodai settlement have no platform.

If these dwellings (15 and 21) were made in only one building stage, we might presume a certain functional structuring of the area for dwellings with a partial platform. Nevertheless, the statistic situation seems to suggest that this type of option is not characteristic for this dwelling.

We remark that, connecting the types of built structures with the pottery complexes criterion, there is no relevant conclusion about the dwellings with total or partial platform.

In what regards the areal connections with the defense trench, three out of the four built structures with a total and partial platform are within the protected area. We nevertheless believe that this situation is irrelevant, especially as we consider the sure existence of several inhabitance sequences to which these structures cannot be certainly attributed

Inner fittings

In what regards the burning structures, we note that 13 built structures had hearths (76% of the total). Also in this situation the analysis of areal dispersion for pottery complexes is irrelevant. We add that the existence of hearth-type burning structures seems to be characteristic. We remark that the structures with an integral platform also had hearths, while only one structure with a partial platform had a hearth.

Hearths were discovered only in two (no. 17 and 24) of the smaller structures (no.10, 17, 19 and 24).

Oven-like burning structures were only discovered in two dwellings (no. 12 and 23).

Also in this case the connections between the pottery complexes areal distribution and characteristics are random and therefore must be considered as irrelevant.

Bench-like fittings were observed in only two built structures (12 and 21), the first with an integral and the second with a partial platform (both with hearths).

Separation inner wall may have existed only in the case of dwelling no. 12.

Other two built structures have table-like inner fittings (no. 5 and 10), i.e. about 12%. None of them had a platform and only one had a hearth.

Significant inventory

There are many factors that should be principally taken into account when we try

to make a finer and implicitly more fruitful analysis. Out of all these factors we choose the grinders, due to the expressive hints towards the occupations and also inner built areas structuring..

We thus remark that out of a total of 17 built structures only six contained either whole or fragmented grinders (no. 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 23). To these six we may also add structure no. 9, where a fragment of claw-tool was discovered, probably provenient from a place specially fitted for grinding. All these discoveries prove the presence of grinders in about 41% of the total number of built structures, enough to be considered as a specific feature.

About 30% of the built structures had traces of white color with whom the walls might have been covered. This percentage does not allow us to say that this might have been a dominant feature for this settlement. If we nevertheless take into account the eventual changes due to destructions happened after their abandoning (no matter the reason) and the post depositional evolution, we believe that this might have structured a significant predilection.

We mention that from our point of view the built area criterion is not enough in itself to determine the use of the respective built structure. Data about built structures at the Râpa lui Bodai settlement show that there are only three structures smaller than 20 m²: no.10 (18 m²), no.17 (18 m²) and eventually no.19 (10 m²).Built structure no. 19 is an example that proves that interpretations made only on the basis of the built area width should not be accepted in all case (Ibidem, 1981, p.78, Fig.128), as its conservation state does not allow firm conclusions. Very close to this category is also dwelling no. 24 (23 m²). All the other built structures exceed 30 m². It is significant that structures from the first category are individualized by a series of attributes. Thus, none of them has neither a partial nor an integral platform and no entire or fragmented grinders.

We remember that dwellings no. 10 and 19 have no burning structure; burning structures appear in no. 17 and no. 24.

In conclusion, according to these features, it seems very possible (even though not all characteristic data sets exist) that these buildings might have been appendixes or, at least, areas with different functions.

We may believe that at least some of the domestic activities may have been performed inside them. This idea is argumented also by the fact that many of the other dwellings contained no grinders inside them. This may suggest that their role was not only that of ware houses but also of workshops for various activities. A supplementary argument is shown by the discoveries from dwelling no. 21. Here no hearth was found, but a hearth most probably used by the dwelling's inhabitants was discovered near the western side.

This is not a singular case at Târpeşti, as most of the grinders and hearths discovered in the same dwellings were not grouped. This might suggest that certain activities, such as the food primary preparation were performed in an area not close to the hearth. On the contrary, pottery fragments belonging to big probably supply jars (probably for fluids – e.g. water) were discovered near the hearths.

The integral digging of the settlement also allowed the observation of only one structure (no. 9) whose inventory might have allowed us to conclude that it could have been also used as a specific working place: a stone (menilite) workshop.

The discovery at only 9 m. west of dwelling no. 21 of a stones pile allowed the hypothesis that its purpose was the tools manufacturing. This may mean that this activity was performed in a not built but functionally delimited area. All existing data may help us believe that this idea is most probable.

These two situations underline that the specific activity areas were more probably randomly positioned (possibly even outside the dwellings) and not in well

defined areas. This idea is helped by the lack of any such remnants inside the built areas.

We want to remind that very few materials are provenient from the level generically attributed to the Cucuteni A stage (13 spindles and only two weighs made of burnt clay, Ibidem, 1981, Fig.201/26-37;38-39), that can be connected to other occupations such as spinning and weaving. For the time being, the context of these discoveries may suggest that these occupations were preponderantly organized outside the built structures. This raises several interpretation problems regarding their areal position and economic weight as well as time interval.

A special discussion is raised by dwelling no. 12 (Ibidem, 1981, p.75-76, Fig.7,118-1-3;123;124-1). Its area has 120 m². The employed building solutions are: platform for the entire built structure, separation wall. The internal fittings comprise: backless bench, hearths, oven; inventory: several grinders, many pottery fragments with various shapes and decorations, copper pieces, a stamp seal (the only one discovered at Târpeşti), anthropomorphic statues. Thus, the dwelling is one of the richest and possibly the most important. Its position inside the dwelling is also worth mentioning, as it does not have a central position but it is placed towards the South – eastern part of the area inhabited by the Cucutenian community. It was attributed to the Cucuteni A2 stage on the basis of pottery characteristics from the discoveries made in its inner part. If the prevailing criteria were the area, fittings and inventory, than we might believe that this dwelling was inhabited by several important members of the community (very probably a family).

We return to a statement whose consequences have not been sufficiently studied. This statement says that, on the basis of pottery complexes, it was possible to determine at least three probable inhabiting levels (Cucuteni A1, Cucuteni A1-A2 and Cucuteni A2). If we admit this possibility, than this implies an entire series of consequences that must be analyzed at least in the future studies` perspective.

The first consequence is that the inhabitance at Râpa lui Bodai did not always have the same intensity. This, if we admit the diggings` results: first sequence consists of 5 built structures, the second only of two, while the third sequence has 10 such structures. This inevitably imply certain conclusions in what regards the dimensions of this community, either if we admit the three sequences as contemporary or not.

Another problem raised by these observations questions whether this area was inhabited by one or more communities. In the first case, this might have oscillated, while in the latter the communities successively inhabited this place. Even if we have an answer to this question, other immediately rises: which was the exact type of economy used here, and why did these population oscillations occur? Which was, if it was, the value of time interval or intervals between these occupational moments?

As a consequence, the separate study of complexes was imposed even from the point of view of the presented hypotheses. Thus, this separate and not global study was indicated so that their potential characteristics could have been identified and collected data checked. Only at this moment of the analysis, the types of various artifacts categories might have been proven as a very useful conceptual mean (under the condition of its systematic performance). Subsequently, the correlation of obtained data might have allowed the archaeological complexes reconstitution attempt, without which any conclusion or synthesis seems to remain random.

But these are problems that must be studied in other occasions, when other diggings shall be made.

REFERENCES

Boghian, D., 2001,

Quelques considerations sur les aspects regionaux du complexe Cucuteni-Tripolye, in Mem. Antiq., XXII.

Cook, Sheburne, F., Heizer, Robert, F., 1968,

Relationships among Houses, Settlement Areas, and Population in Aboriginal California, în K. C. Chang (ed.), Settlement Archaeology, Palo Alto, California.

Coudart, A., 1999,

Maisons d'hier et maisons d'aujourd'hui. L'espace domestique fabrique et donne à voir la société, în F. Braemer, S. Cleziou, A. Coudart, (eds.), Habitat et société.

Deetz, J., 1968,

Cultural Patterning of Behavior as Reflected by Archaeological Materials, in K.C. Chang, (ed.), Settlement Archaeology, Palo Alto.

Dergacev, V., 1993,

Modeles d'etablissement de la culture de Tripolie, în Prehistoire Européenne, 5.

Dumitrescu, Vl., 1957,

Le dépot d'objets de parure de Hăbăşeşti et le problème des rapports entre les tribus de la civilisation de Cucuteni et les tribus des steppes pontiques, in Dacia, (N.S.), I, 73-96.

Dragomir I.T., 1962,

Unele consideraţii cu privire la modul de construcţie al locuinţelor din aşezările culturii Cucuteni-Tripolie, in SCIV, XIII, 2.

Dumitrescu, Vl., 1958,

La station prehistorique de Hăbăşeşti et quelques-uns des problemes de la civilisation de Cucuteni-Tripolie, in P.A., XLIX, Praga.

Dumitrescu, Vl., 1960,

Complexul cultural Cucuteni, in Istoria României (History of Romania), I, Bucureşti.

Dumitrescu VL., 1963a,

Originea şi evoluţia culturii Cucuteni-Tripolie (I) in SCIVA, 14, 1; II în SCIVA, 14.2.

Dumitrescu, Vl., 1963b,

Origine et evolution de la civilisation de Cucuteni-Tripolie, in Archeologia, Warszawa-Wroclaw, 14.

Dumitrescu, VL., 1967,

Hăbăşeşti. Satul neolitic de pe Holm, Bucureşti, Ed. Meridiane.

Dumitrescu, Vl., 1968,

Cu privire la platformele de lut ars ale locuinţelor unor culturi neolitice, in A.M.N., V.

Dumitrescu, Vl., 1974,

Aspecte regionale în aria de răspândire a culturii Cucuteni, în cursul primei sale faze de dezvoltare, in S.C.I.V.A., 4.25.

Dumitrescu, Vl., 1976,

Remarques à propos de certain aspects régionaux dans l'aire de diffusion de la culture de Cucuteni, pendant sa première phase (A), în Festchrift für Richard Pittioni zum siebzigsten Geburtstag.

Dumitrescu, 1983,

Epoque néolithique et énéolithique, în Vl. Dumitrescu, Al. Bolomey, Fl. Mogoşanu, Esquisse d'une préhistoire de la Roumanie, Bucureşti

Dumitrescu, Vl.,Dumitrescu, H., Petrescu-Dîmboviţa, M.,Gostar, N., 1954,

Hăbăşeşti. Monografie arheologică. Bucureşti

Ellis, Linda, 1987,

Population growth, foodstorage and ceramic manufacturing centers in pre-Bronze Age Europe, in B.A.I, I.

Ellis, Linda, 1996,

Cultural boundaries and human behavior: Method, theory and Late Neolithic ceramic production in the Carpathian - Pontic region, în Gh. Dumitroaia, D.Monah, (eds), Cucuteni aujourd'hui, P.Neamţ.

Jongsma, T., Greenfield, H. J., 2002,

The Household as Behaviour: An Anthropological perspective, în L.

Nikolova, (ed.), Material Evidence and Cultural Pattern in Prehistory, Salt Lake City-Sofia-Karlovo, RPRP, 5. 2001(2002).

László, A., 1988,

Date noi privind tehnica de construcție a locuințelor neolitice, in Arh.Mold., XII.

LeBlanc, S., 1971,

An Addition to Naroll's Suggested Floor Area and Settlement Population Relationship, in American Antiquity, 36, (2).

Mantu, C-M., 1998,

Cultura Cucuteni. Evoluție, Cronologie. Legături, Piatra Neamț, 1998.

Marinescu-Bîlcu, S., 1981,

Tîrpești. From Prehistory to History in Eastern Romania, B.A.R., I.S., 107, Oxford.

Marinescu-Bîlcu, S., 1989,

Ceramica cucuteniană de la Drăguşeni: tradiții, creații proprii, aspecte regionale, in S.C.I.V.A., 40.3.

Marinescu-Bîlcu, S., 1998,

Considerații pe marginea organizării interne a unora dintre așezările culturilor din complexul Precucuteni-Cucuteni, in, Préhistoire du Bas Danube.

Marinescu-Bîlcu, S., Bolomey, Al., 2000,

Drăguşeni. A Cucutenian Community, Bucureşti, Tübingen.

Monah, D.,Popovici, D., 1985,

Corpusul descoperirilor, în D. Monah, Şt. Cucoş, Aşezările culturii Cucuteni din România, Iaşi

Naroll, R., 1962,

Floor Area and Settlement Population, American Antiquity, 27, (4).

Passek, T.S., 1949b,

Periodizacija tripol'skih poselenij, in M.I.A., 10.

Paul, I., 1967,

În legătură cu problema locuințelor de suprafață cu platformă din așezările culturilor Petreşti şi Cucuteni-Tripolie, in SCIV, 18, 1.

Petrescu-Dîmbovița, M., 1954,

Şanțurile de apărare, în Dumitrescu, Vl. şi colab; Hăbăşeşti, Monografie arheologică. Bucureşti.

Petrescu-Dîmbovița,M., 1993,

Problema așezărilor "protourbane" ale complexului eneolitic Ariuşd-Cucuteni-Tripolie, in Academica, III, 8(32).

Petrescu Dîmbovița, Mircea, 2001,

Eneoliticul dezvoltat, in Istoria Românilor, (History of the Romanians) I, Bucureşti.

Popovici, D. N., 2000,

Cultura Cucuteni. Faza A. Repertoriul așezărilor, (1), Piatra Neamț.

Sorokin, V.Ja., 1993,

Modalitățile de organizare a așezărilor complexului cultural Cucuteni - Tripolie in Arh.Mold., XVI.

Rapoport, A., 1999,

Archaeological Inference and Environment-Behavior Studies, în F. Braemer, S. Cleziou, A. Coudart, (eds.), Habitat et société.

Trigger, B.G., 1968,

Determinants of Settlement Patterns, in K.C. Chang, (ed.), Settlement Archaeology, Palo Alto.

Trigger, B.G., 1972,

Determinants of urban grouth in pre-industrial societies în P.J.Ucko, R.Tringham G.W. Dimbley, (eds.) in Man, settlement and urbanism.

Ursulescu, Nicolae, 2002,

Începuturile istoriei pe teritoriul României, Iași.

Wiessner, P., 1974,

A Functional estimator of Population from Floor Area, American Antiquity, 39, (2).