

Ovidiu COTOI

THE POTTERY, AN INDICATOR OF THE TRADES BETWEEN THE CUCUTENI AND THE NEIGHBOURING COMMUNITIES IN THE LOWER DANUBE AREA

Abstract: Our study aims at drawing the image of the trading relations between the Cucuteni communities and the Gumelnița and Cernavoda I ones, based on the pottery imports found in the settlements belonging to the three cultural areas. Therefore, our intention is to offer a view on the types of these exchanges and to identify their possible routes.

Keywords: archaeological cultures, Cucuteni, Gumelnița, Cernavoda, Stoicani-Aldeni, imports.

*

The Romanian and foreign archaeologists have been interested in the relations between the Ariușd-Cucuteni cultural complex and the neighbouring cultures for a long time, their interest leading to a great number of studies concerning the direct and indirect contacts between these cultural areas. This approach was possible based on the study of the so-called pottery “imports”, present both in the Cucuteni settlements and the ones belonging to the neighbouring cultures, and allowed the specialists to offer a clear image of these relations. Nevertheless, most of the studies focused on the cultural synchronism and on the analysis of the reciprocal influences, neglecting the trading relations between the bearers of these cultures, hidden behind abstract terminology such as “cultural interference”, “cultural interaction / relations”, “cultural contacts”, “imports”, “cultural synchronisms” etc. Our study aims at drawing the image of the trading relations between the Cucuteni communities and the Gumelnița and Cernavoda I ones, based on the pottery imports found in the settlements belonging to the three cultural areas. Therefore our intention is to offer a view on the types of these trades and to identify their possible routes.

The greatest number of Cucuteni imports was discovered in the area of the Gumelnița culture (maps 1 and 2). Thus, several trichrome pottery fragments, painted in the Ariușd technique, with spiral stripes drew in white on a red background and then black framed, were found in the late Gumelnița level from Stoicani (Galați county)¹. Typical Cucuteni materials, trichrome painted, dated

¹ Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, *Cetățuia de la Stoicani*, “Materiale și cercetări arheologice”, I, 1953, p. 130.

probably in the Cucuteni A₂ phase², were also found in the Stoicani-Aldeni area, in the inferior level at Aldeni (Buzău county) together with fragments of cups which, from a morphological and decorative point of view, show similarities with the Ariuşd ones in the south-east of Transylvania³.

An important quantity of Cucutenian pottery materials belonging to the Cucuteni A₃ phase was found in the three sites from Lişoteanca (Brăila county)⁴.

Fragments, but also complete Cucuteni A₃ pots were discovered at Brăiliţa, in the Gumelniţa A₂ level (the IIA level)⁵. It is worth mentioning here a cup discovered in a Gumelniţa settlement, made of fine Cucutenian paste, trichrome decorated, with spiral-meander motifs⁶. A Cucuteni A₂-A₃ fragment was also found in the A₁/A₂ Gumelniţa level at Cireşu-Scărlăteşti (Brăila county)⁷.

The Cucuteni A₂ pottery materials were also found in two earth houses at Râmnicelu (Brăila county) belonging to the A₂ Gumelniţa level⁸.

An interesting situation was noticed at Carcaliu (Tulcea county) where, in the A₂-B₁ level, there could be found Cucuteni A₃ pottery fragments⁹ together with Cucuteni C pottery fragments, containing crushed shells in the paste and comb decoration (*Kammkeramik*)¹⁰. With a view to the trading relations between the two cultures, the case from Carcaliu is interesting, arising the question if the "C" type elements accompanied the Cucuteni ones (the movements of the Cucuteni culture bearers influenced also the movement of the Cucuteni C bearers) or it should be seen as a phenomenon on its own under the form of the Cucuteni C elements infiltration into the Gumelniţa area, similar to that taking place in the Cucuteni area, or to the women exchange in the exogamous marital relationships. In our opinion, the second hypothesis seems more plausible. In this case, the Cucuteni materials circulated alone, within some trades different from the ones through which the C pottery arrives in the Gumelniţa environment from Carcaliu.

² Eugen Comşa, *La relations entre les cultures Cucuteni et Gumelniţa*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmboviţa (ed.), *La civilisation de Cucuteni en contexte européen*, Bibliotheca archaeologica iassensis I, Iaşi, 1987, p. 82.

³ *Ibidem*.

⁴ Nicolae Harţuche, *Raport asupra săpăturilor de la Lişoteanca, jud. Brăila*, "Materiale şi cercetări arheologice", Tulcea, 1980, p. 67, p. 76; Idem, *Cercetările arheologice de la Lişoteanca I. Aşezarea "Movila Olarului" (1970-1976)*, "Istros", V, 1987, p. 33; E. Comşa, *op. cit.*, p. 84; Puiu Haşotti, Dragomir Popovici, *Cultura Cernavoda I în contextul descoperirilor de la Hârşova*, "Pontica", XXV, 1992, p. 41; Cornelia-Magda Mantu, *Cultura Cucuteni. Evoluţie, cronologie, legături*, Bibliotheca Memoriae Antiquitatis, Piatra Neamţ, 1998, p. 69.

⁵ N. Harţuche, *Săpăturile de la Brăiliţa*, "Materiale şi cercetări arheologice", V, 1959, p. 225; N. Harţuche, F. Anastasiu, *Catalogul selectiv al colecţiei de arheologie a Muzeului Brăilei*, Brăila, 1976, p. 105, no. 176, fig. 176; E. Comşa, *op. cit.*, p. 83; Cornelia-Magda Mantu, *Cultura Cucuteni*, p. 69.

⁶ N. Harţuche, *Săpăturile de la Brăiliţa*, p. 225; N. Harţuche, F. Anastasiu, *op. cit.*, p. 105, no. 176.

⁷ Valeriu Sîrbu, *Cercetările arheologice de la Cireşu*, "Istros", I, 1980, p. 25, pl. VI/ 3a-b.

⁸ N. Harţuche, F. Anastasiu, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁹ Elena Lăzurcă, *Ceramica cucuteniană în contextul aşezării gumelniţene de la Carcaliu (judeţul Tulcea)*, "Peuce", X, 1, 1990, pp. 13-14.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*.

In Dobruđa, the Cucuteni A₃ imports could be found at Hârșova (Constanța county) in the Gumelnița A₂ level¹¹ but also in the following one, Cernavoda I, where together with more late Gumelnița materials there also appear trichrome painted materials, with narrow stripe, belonging to the Cucuteni A₃-A₄¹². A Cucuteni C fragment was discovered in the same level, having crushed shell in its composition, oxidating fired, decorated with triangle impressions¹³.

For the Gumelnița B₁ phase, there have been documented Cucuteni pottery findings from Cucuteni A₃ stage at Căscioarele. It is a fragmentary antropomorphic pot, decorated in the Cucuteni A₃ style¹⁴. The importance of this discovery is greater as the Cucuteni pot seems to belong to a ritual complex.

For Gumelnița B₂ phase we mention the late Cucuteni A materials (A₃ final or A₄) in the 2b level from Brăilița, a level synchronic with the Gumelnița B₂ level from Vidra (Ilfov county)¹⁵.

The Cucuteni pottery materials were also found in the Cernavoda I area (map 3). Besides the findings in the I_a level at Hârșova mentioned above, Cucuteni painted pottery was identified in other settlements too. Thus, Cucuteni imports, dated in A-B phase, are present in the Cernavoda I settlement at Oltenița-Renie (Călărași county)¹⁶, and Cucuteni B₂ materials in the Cernavoda I_c level at Pietroasele (Buzău county)¹⁷ and at Râmnicelu¹⁸.

The A-B and B Cucuteni pottery was also found in the Republic of Moldova, in the necropolis belonging to the Cernavoda I culture. The findings at Sărățeni and Roșcani¹⁹ are representative for the first stage of the Cernavoda I culture, while the Cucuteni B pottery appears in the funeral complexes at Novocotovsc, Koșari and Hadjider in the late phase²⁰.

A special case is represented by the settlement at Râmnicelu. In the Cernavoda I level, the amount of Cucuteni B pottery is unusually big, about 40% of the total pottery²¹ suggesting that it was produced in that place, probably by the people living there, who learned the technology and the style of the Cucuteni

¹¹ D. Popovici, P. Hașotti, *Considerations about the Synchronism of the Cernavoda I Culture*, "Pontica", XXI-XXII, 1988-1989, pp. 293-296.

¹² D. Popovici, P. Hașotti, Doina Galbenu, Nicolae Constantin, *Cercetările arheologice din tell-ul de la Hârșova, județul Constanța*, "Cercetări arheologice", IX, 1992, p. 10; D. Popovici, P. Hașotti, *Considerations about the Synchronism of the Cernavoda I Culture*, pp. 293-296.

¹³ P. Hașotti, D. Popovici, *Cultura Cernavoda I*, pp. 40-41.

¹⁴ Vladimir Dumitrescu, *Considerations et données nouvelles sur le problème du synchronisme des civilisations de Cucuteni et Gumelnița*, "Dacia", N.S., 1964, p. 61; E. Comșa, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

¹⁵ N. Harțuche, *Săpăturile de la Brăilița*, p. 226; E. Comșa, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-84; P. Hașotti, D. Popovici, *Cultura Cernavoda I*, p. 48.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 41; Cornelia-Magda Mantu, *Cultura Cucuteni*, p. 69.

¹⁷ P. Hașotti, D. Popovici, *Cultura Cernavoda I*, p. 42; Cornelia-Magda Mantu, *Cultura Cucuteni*, p. 69.

¹⁸ N. Harțuche, F. Anastasiu, *op. cit.*, p. 17; P. Hașotti, D. Popovici, *Cultura Cernavoda I*, p. 41.

¹⁹ Igor Manzura, *Culturi eneolitice în zona de stepă*, "Thraco-Dacica", XV, 1-2, 1994, p. 99; Cornelia-Magda Mantu, *Cultura Cucuteni*, p. 70.

²⁰ I. Manzura, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

²¹ N. Harțuche, F. Anastasiu, *op. cit.*, p. 17; N. Harțuche, *Raport asupra săpăturilor de la Lișoteanca*, p. 65.

painting. This statement is based on the archaeological context and the technological information offered by the Cucuteni pottery at Râmnicelu. Thus, although the pottery is made of a very good quality paste, the grey core of some fragments²² indicates an insufficient firing temperature resulting in an incomplete firing, which differentiates it from similar Cucuteni products. In addition to the Cucuteni pottery, the archaeologists also mentioned a pottery type imitating the Cucuteni one, made of the same kind of paste, fired in similar conditions, but reproducing more the Cernavoda shapes and less the Cucuteni ones. All these data indicate the existence of a pottery centre at Râmnicelu, where the Cucuteni products were imitated and then took the route of trades. Of course, we need some further information regarding the raw materials used and the firing technology in order to identify the intrusive or non-intrusive character of the Cucuteni pottery from there and to determine the importance of the Cernavoda settlement at Râmnicelu in the trading network in the Lower Danube area.

The Gumelnița pottery imports in the Cucuteni area, as shown by some researchers, are present in a smaller number than the Cucuteni imports in the Gumelnița cultural environment²³ (map 4). The first contacts between the Gumelnița bearers and the Precucuteni-Cucuteni ones took place in the Precucuteni II phase as shown by the Precucuteni import in the Gumelnița settlement at Vidra²⁴. During the Precucuteni III phase, Gumelnița pottery and plastic art appear at Traian-Dl. Fântânilor²⁵, Târpești (Neamț county)²⁶ and Poduri (Bacău county), where an *askos* pot and a replica of a house were discovered²⁷. For the Cucuteni A phase, we mention the graphite painted pot in the Cucuteni A₂ level at Ruseștii Noi (the Republic of Moldova)²⁸ and the *rython* pots at Scânteia and Dumești (Vaslui county) in the final Cucuteni A₃ area²⁹, the one at Trușești (Botoșani county), the Cucuteni A₃ level³⁰ and at Izvoare-Piatra-Neamț, the Cucuteni A level³¹.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 65.

²³ E. Comșa, *op. cit.*, p. 85; Cornelia-Magda Mantu, *Cultura Cucuteni*, p. 47.

²⁴ Vladimir Dumitrescu, *Considerații cu privire la poziția cronologică a culturii Cucuteni în raport cu culturile vecine*, "Apulum", VIII, 1, 1968, p. 39; Dan Monah, Ștefan Cucuș, *Așezările culturii Cucuteni din România*, Iași, 1985, p. 37.

²⁵ Hortensia Dumitrescu, *Contribuții la problema originii culturii Precucuteni*, "Studii și cercetări de istorie veche", VIII, 1-4, 1957, p. 69; E. Comșa, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

²⁶ Silvia Marinescu-Bîlcu, *Cultura Precucuteni pe teritoriul României*, Biblioteca de arheologie, 22, București, 1974, p. 84, p. 99, p. 139; D. Monah, Șt. Cucuș, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

²⁷ Cornelia-Magda Mantu, Gheorghe Dumitroaia, *Catalogue*, in *Cucuteni*, 1997, p. 181, no. 13-14, fig. 13-14.

²⁸ D. Monah, Șt. Cucuș, *op. cit.*, p. 38. Cornelia-Magda Mantu, *Cultura Cucuteni*, p. 145.

²⁹ Ruxandra Maxim-Alaiba, *Locuința nr. 1 din faza Cucuteni A₃ de la Dumești (Vaslui)*, "Acta Moldaviae Meridionalis", V-VI, 1983-1984, p. 118; Cornelia-Magda Mantu, *Cultura Cucuteni*, p. 145.

³⁰ Anton Nițu, *Reprezentările zoomorfe plastice pe ceramica neoneolitică carpato-dunăreană*, "Arheologia Moldovei", VII, 1972, p. 23; Cornelia-Magda Mantu, Senica Țurcanu, *Scânteia, cercetare arheologică și restaurare*, Iași, 1999, p. 67.

³¹ Silvia Marinescu-Bîlcu, *Askoï et rhytons néolithiques des régions balkano-danubiennes et leur relations avec le sud, à la lumière de quelques pièces de Câscioarele*, "Dacia", N.S. 34, 1990, p. 21; Cornelia-Magda Mantu, *Cultura Cucuteni*, p. 67.

A special discovery is the deposit of ornament objects at Brad (Bacău county) belonging to the Cucuteni A level. The pieces were placed in an *askos* type pot missing the upper part, made of an oxidant fired paste, with many crushed shards in its composition³², differentiating it from the typical Cucuteni pottery.

The *askos* pots are widespread in the Carpathian-Balkan Calcolithic, in the Gumelnița culture area also, the pot from Brad having analogies at Kalino in Thracia³³, Karonovo VI³⁴, Ciolănești (Teleorman county)³⁵, Căscioarele (Călărași county)³⁶ and Brăilița (Brăila county)³⁷. Therefore, the shape and the paste quality of the pot from Brad seem to indicate the Gumelnița origin, its presence in the Cucutenian settlement could only have been explained by the existence of trades between the two neighbouring communities.

As regards the presence of the Cernavoda I pottery in the Cucuteni settlements, if it is the case, this is hardly differentiated from the so-called Cucuteni C type. Ștefan Cucoș, noticing the variety of the “kitchen pottery” (especially in the paste technology) does not exclude the southern influence of the Cernavoda I culture³⁸. The reality of the Cernavoda I culture influence on the Cucuteni C pottery is questionable. It is more important to notice the process of cultural interference taking place in the contact area in the north-east of Wallachia, between the Cucuteni elements and the Cernavoda I ones, resulting in a synthesis pottery type called the “Monteoru variant”.

The “Monteoru variant” appears in the late Cucuteni B₂ level, in the Cucuteni settlements in the curvature Subcarpathian area, from where it circulates in the Cucuteni environment in the Subcarpathian area (map 5) as shown by the findings at Podei-Târgu Ocna³⁹, Gura Văii⁴⁰, Calu-Piatra Șoimului⁴¹ and Poduri⁴²,

³² Vasile Ursachi, *Le dépôt d'objets de parure énéolithique de Brad, com. Negri, dep. de Bacău*, in *Le paléolithique et le néolithique*, Bibliotheca archaeologica iassensis IV, Iași, 1991, p. 337; Idem, *Depozitul de obiecte de podoabă eneolitice de la Brad, com. Negri, jud. Bacău*, “Carpica”, XXIII, 2, 1992, pp. 51-104.

³³ Georgi I. Georgiev, *Kulturgruppen der Jungstein und der Kupferzeit in der Ebne von Thrazien (Sudbulgarien)*, in *L'Europe à la fin de l'âge de la pierre. Actes de symposium consacré aux problèmes du Néolithique européen, Prague-Liblice-Brno, 5-12 octobre, 1959*, Praha, 1961, pl. XXVI/8a-8b; V. Ursachi, *Le dépôt d'objets de parure énéolithique*, p. 343.

³⁴ G. I. Georgiev, *op. cit.*, pl. XXIII/4; V. Ursachi, *Le depot d'objets*, p. 343.

³⁵ A. Nițu, *op. cit.*, p. 21, fig. 8/3.

³⁶ Gheorghe Ștefan, *Les fouilles de Căscioarele*, “Dacia”, II, 1925, p. 162; V. Ursachi, *Le depot d'objets*, p. 343.

³⁷ N. Harțușche, Ion T. Dragomir, *Săpăturile arheologice de la Brăilița*, “Materiale și cercetări arheologice”, III, 1957, pp. 133-134, fig. 4/1-2; N. Harțușche, *Săpăturile de la Brăilița*, p. 226; V. Ursachi, *Le depot d'objets*, p. 343.

³⁸ Șt. Cucoș, *Ceramica de tip „C” din aria culturii Cucuteni*, “Memoria Antiquitatis”, IX-XI (1977-1979), 1985, p. 73.

³⁹ Constantin Matasă, *Așezarea eneolitică Cucuteni B de la Târgu Ocna-Podei (raionul Târgu Ocna-Podei, regiunea Bacău)*, “Arheologia Moldovei”, II-III, 1964, p. 45, fig. 30/2; 32/1, 3-5, 7; 33/11; A. Nițu, C. Buzdugan, C. Eminovici, *Descoperirile arheologice de la Gura Văii (Municipiul Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej)*, “Carpica”, IV, 1971, p. 65, fig. 24/2-3.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 65; Șt. Cucoș, *Faza Cucuteni B în zona subcarpatică a Moldovei*, Bibliotheca Memoriae Antiquitatis VI, Piatra-Neamț, 1999, p. 117.

⁴¹ *Ibidem*.

but also in the Siret and Pruth area, as indicated by the pottery fragments at Cucuteni-Cetățuia⁴³ and Ștefănești-Stârcea (Botoșani county)⁴⁴. The paste is of good quality, rough, sometimes with an external polished face, as at Gura Văii, for example⁴⁵, dark or light brown, sometimes black, depending on the effect of firing, indicating a tradition and technology different from the Cucuteni one, asserting its foreign origin. The shapes (bowls and short neck pots and turned up rim) as well as the painted or the plastic decorations, among which can be noticed the highly stylized bull heads⁴⁶, suggest the Cucuteni influence. The buttons on the shoulders or on the maximum curvature of the pots are similar to the ones in the Cucuteni C pottery, but also to the Cernavoda I_c pottery⁴⁷. Although this type of pottery is not present in a great number of settlements, its presence in the more northern ones and the ones in the inter-river Siret-Pruth, suggests an active circulation of its bearers in the Cucuteni cultural area and also intense trading relations with the local populations.

Some final remarks should be made at the end of this analysis. Firstly, it is obvious that in terms of quantity the Cucuteni imports in the Gumelnița and Cernavoda I settlements outnumber the Gumelnița and Cernavoda ones in the Cucuteni settlements. Secondly, the paste technique and the painting style are Cucutenian. The pot from Gumelnița does not allow any doubts on its origin and indicates the importance and the high appreciation of the Cucuteni pottery in the Gumelnița environment. This could be an explanation for the great number of Cucuteni imports in the Gumelnița settlements leading to the conclusion that they could circulate as “goods” on their own.

Thirdly, we can notice the presence of Ariușd elements in the earlier stages of the Gumelnița culture, coming from the south-east of Transylvania, which indicates the existence of trades between the members of the communities on both sides of the Carpathians.

The geographical distribution of the Cucuteni pottery imports allows us to make some remarks on the circulation of this category of goods as well as on the importance of the Danube as a circulation route in the trading network. During the Gumelnița A stage, the Cucuteni pottery materials appear in settlements on the Danube (Brăilița, Carcaliu, Hârșova) or on its tributaries, the Buzău river (Râmnicel) and the Călmățui river (Cireșu, Lișoteanca, Însurăței) (map 1) indicating the existence of a trading network in the Danube area and its tributaries area. The most

⁴² Dan Monah, D. Popovici, Gh. Dumitroaia, Șt. Cucuș, Alexe Bujor, *Raport preliminar asupra săpăturilor arheologice de la Poduri-Dealul Ghindaru (1984-1985)*, “Memoria Antiquitatis”, XV-XVII (1983-1985), 1987, p. 113; Șt. Cucuș, *Faza Cucuteni B*, p. 117.

⁴³ Hubert Schmidt, *Cucuteni in der Oberen Moldau, Rumänien. Die befestigte Siedlung mit bemalte Keramik von der Steinkupferzeit in bis die vollentwickelte Bronzezeit*, Berlin-Leipzig, 1932, p. 45, pl. 24/5.

⁴⁴ A. Nițu, *Continuitatea ceramicii pictate între culturile Cucuteni – Tripolie și Gorodsk-Usatovo (Horodiștea-Foltești)*, “Cercetări istorice”, S.N., VIII, 1977, pp. 145-212; Șt. Cucuș, *Faza Cucuteni B*, p. 150.

⁴⁵ A. Nițu, C. Buzdugan, C. Eminovici, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*; Șt. Cucuș, *Faza Cucuteni B*, p. 117.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*.

southern findings of Cucuteni pottery in this stage are the ones from Hârşova, but this situation reflects more a certain stage of researches than a historical reality.

In the Gumelniţa B phase, the number of findings is smaller, the Cucuteni pottery being present in three settlements only (Brăiliţa, Căscioarele and Gumelniţa), all of them placed on the Danube (map 2). However, the situation is relevant enough for the importance of the Danube river in trades at great distances which involved the members of the Cucuteni communities and those of the late Gumelniţa communities. The presence of the Cucuteni pottery in Gumelniţa settlements in the south of Romania, at hundreds of kilometres from the southern boundary of the Cucuteni area, indicates a Danubian route followed by these materials, although, in this stage of the researches, there are not similar findings that interpose between the findings from Brăiliţa and the ones from Căscioarele and Gumelniţa. It is important to notice that even in the next stage, corresponding to the evolution of the Cernavoda I culture, the findings at Pietroasele (a little bit eccentric to the area we refer to), Râmnicelu, Hârşova and Olteniţa-Renie indicate a constant usage of the routes already known (map 3), showing that the contacts with the Danube areas did not stop, although they are not so intense.

The hydrographical network also played an important part in the circulation of goods from the Gumelniţa area to the northern Cucuteni settlements, as shown by the geographical distribution of the pottery imports. The small number of settlements where Gumelniţa pottery could be found does not allow us to rigorously trace the routes followed by these, but findings such as the ones from Izvoare, Brad, Dumeşti, Scânteia or Truşeşti indicate that the goods coming from the Gumelniţa space circulated towards the north, along the main river streams, the Siret and Pruth, and their tributaries.

On the other hand, the small number of Gumelniţa pottery findings in the Cucuteni environment does not allow us to appreciate the intensity of these trades. Surely, the Cucuteni-Gumelniţa trades are more intense than shown by the Gumelniţa pottery presence in the Cucuteni environment. A clearer image of the trades between the members of the two communities can be drawn taking into account other trade indicators such as stone and copper tools and weapons, jewels and prestige objects etc.

We can draw some conclusions regarding the characteristics of these trades. Both the pots at Brad and Scânteia, Dumeşti, Truşeşti or Izvoare are not utilitarian pottery, even if the paste is not of very good quality all the time. The role of *askos* and *rython* pots should be related more to the religious practices, having a symbolic meaning, as shown by the deposit at Brad. Therefore, when we refer to the types of trades in which these products are involved, we have to take into account their function as well. We can suppose that the presence of *askos* and *rython* pots in the Cucuteni culture area can be explained by ritual trades, being circulated due to their symbolic value and meaning. It is also possible that the presence of these pots in the Cucuteni area could be explained by the integration of some Gumelniţa members in the Cucuteni settlements.

The trades between the members of the Cucuteni and Cernavoda I communities also have peculiar characteristics. The circulation of people and goods

is also accompanied by the exchanges of ideas: technical and technological information, aesthetical values, artistic patterns etc. The case from Râmnicelu is significant in this regard, where we witness a transfer of pottery technology, the Cernavoda community from here assimilating the superior Cucuteni techniques of making and firing the paste. These permanent contacts and exchanges will also result in a synthesis pottery such as “the Monteoru variant”, combining both the Cucuteni and Cernavoda I traditions.

Found in the north-east of Wallachia, this type of pottery could also be found in the north in the Cucuteni settlements placed in the Moldavia mountainous and sub-mountainous areas, such as the ones at Podei-Tg. Ocna, Gura Văii, Poduri, Calu-Piatra Șoimului. All these settlements are placed near salty springs exploited by the communities from there. Therefore, we can assert the existence of trades between these communities and the ones producing the “Monteoru variant” pottery, salt playing a very important part. Also we do not exclude the possibility that the representatives of this community have played an important part in the circulation of salt in the rest of the extra-Carpathian area, this hypothesis has to be sustained by new researches and discoveries.

Piatra-Neamț–Galați





