

Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica, VII, Iași, 2000

**CUCUTENI-TRIPOLYE CULTURAL COMPLEX: RELATIONS
AND SYNCHRONISMS WITH OTHER CONTEMPORANEOUS
CULTURES FROM THE BLACK SEA AREA**

CORNELIA-MAGDA MANTU
(Institute of Archaeology Iași)

Since its appearance, in the beginning of the 5th millenium and until its end, maybe at the beginning of the 3rd millenium BC, Cucuteni Tripolye cultural complex has been very dynamic, covering an area of more than 35000 kmp due to its permanent extension to the east, north-east and finally to south-west (VI. DUMITRESCU 1985, 39; ELLIS 1984, 12-14; MONAH 1992, 392).

Based on Balkan-Anatolian tradition, graded on a Carpatian-Danubian fond, Cucuteni-Tripolye communities took new elements from the neighbouring communities, at the same level of evolution or from other neolithic ones, which led in the end to an eneolithic evolution. Here we shall try to present this kind of relations, with other vecinity communities from the Black Sea area, taking into account archaeological imports, analogies between different kind of discoveries, or even the new historical-economical analysis.

When Precucuteni culture first appearead, in the south-east part of the Romanian territory, there have been noticed settlements belonging to the Boian and Hamangia cultures; archaeological discoveries showing stronfgg relations between all members of such communities.

On the Precucuteni culture level (I-III: 5050-4600 B.C.)/Tripolye A (4850/4750-4350 B.C.), discoveries from the Boian settlement, Tangâru (MARINESCU-BÎLCU 1974, 131; 1976, 347), or those from Florești, Precucuteni III (ZBENOVIC 1989, 138; SOROKIN 1994, 70) demonstrate relations with the Boian III-IV communities; this kind of relations could have been established between about 4900-4500 B.C.

Also with the southern neighborhood Hamangia culture, with a longer evolution, Precucuteni communities seem to have had close relations, illustrated by several archaeological discoveries (MARINESCU-

BÎLCU 1974, 128; 1981, 8, 14; 1991, 14; DUMITRESCU, VULPE 1988, 36; HAȘOTTI 1991, 256). Strong influences from Hamangia III could be found in the anthropomorphic Precucuteni representations (MARINESCU-BÎLCU 1993, 199). It is necessary to notice the presence of Precucuteni materials in some settlements belonging to this culture in Romania, too (Limanu, Golovița, Baia, Mangalia, Cernavoda) and even in the south part of the Black Sea shore until Burgas, in Bulgaria.

Relative and absolute chronology of the Hamangia III seems to indicate the evolution of this phase between 5050-4800 B.C., which corresponds to the evolution of Precucuteni I-II. This synchronism will be preserved at the level of Hamangia IV and Precucuteni III too, the last one being also partially contemporaneous with the beginning of Gumelnița A1 in Dobrogea (MANTU 1998, 143, 145).

Older or even new discoveries show similar materials to Precucuteni II and III until Central Anatolia (CHILDE 1956, 27-30; TEZCAN 1958; ESIN 1993, 47; MAKKAY 1993, 123). Mainly, this refers to discoveries from the Gelverly Güzelyurt and from other sites (Köşpınar, Yeniyapam, Yassiören, Sapmazköy, Karaliler, Bucak, Höyücek, Dündartepe, Alışar Ib), in which M. Özdoğan believes to have found ceramics similar to Precucuteni II-III, Vinča, Marica and Gumelnița (ÖZDOĞAN 1993). Some anthropomorphic statuettes from Dündartepe and Alışar Ib are similar to the Precucuteni culture, too.

During Gumelnița A1 phase (4650-4550 B.C.), relations with the Precucuteni areal seem to be as strong as before, if we take into consideration the Precucuteni III materials from some Gumelnița sites, Tangâru, Vidra, Măgurele (ROMAN 1963, 33-50; MARINESCU-BÎLCU 1974, 131, 135-136), or the demonstrated Gumelnița influences from other Precucuteni sites, Traian-Dealul Fântânilor, Târgu Frumos, (H. DUMITRESCU 1955a, 463; MARINESCU-BÎLCU 1974, 99, 352-353; URSULESCU, BOGHIAN 1996). Maybe at the same level of the Precucuteni III phase, when Gumelnița culture appears, its Stoicani-Aldeni-Bolgrad aspect appears, too (4600-4350 B.C.). Some influences from this cultural aspect reflected both, in ceramics and plastic representations, are noticed into some Precucuteni III sites, Târgu Frumos, Hansca, Cărbuna, Bahrinești VIII (URSULESCU, BOGHIAN 1996; SOROKIN 1994, 75).

After this southern investigation, we will enlarge our analysis to the

east. At this chronological level, Precucuteni III/Tripolye A east-ward from this area evolves the Bug-Nistrean culture, at a certain distance the Dnieper-Donets culture, in the south part of this areal the Sursk-Dnieper culture and in Crimeea, the South Crimeea culture (Fig. 1). In some archaeological discoveries and in some Precucuteni I and III sites are mentioned bug-nistrean pots or some imitations after this kind of pots (Traian-Dealul Viei, Florești: H. DUMITRESCU 1976, 47-50). Precucuteni/Tripolye A imports are also noticed in the Southern Bug area, in the Bug-Nistrean culture (Savran phase) (VIDEJKO 1994, 9). Furthermore, Precucuteni I and late bug-nistrean materials have been found in some sites of the Sursk-Dnieper culture (TELEGIN, TITOVA 1993, 468) and in the Vovcik necropole (DANILENKO 1969, 188, 216; COMȘA 1994, 295). The analysis of this kind of materials seem to show an archaeological and chronological incongruous, connected maybe with the stage of the researches. If we accept that Precucuteni I-II evolved between 5050-4750 B.C., the Bug-Nistrean culture, with 4-5 phases of evolution (MARKEVIČ 1974; GIMBUTAS 1992, II, 375; LARINA 1994, 43), could be placed between about 5800-5250, which excludes any contemporaneity or relations between these cultures. Such kind of relations noticed below could be accepted if there were some bug-nistrean survivals; Sursk-Dnieper culture is dated in the end of the 6th and the beginning of the 5th millenium (TELEGIN, TITOVA 1993, 468). This is why, in my opinion, the Tripolye BI type materials from Uspenska site, belonging to Bug-nistrean culture (TITOVA 1983;SOROKIN 1997, 21) must be accepted with some reserve.

Precucuteni III (4750-4600 B.C.)/Tripolye A (Boriskovska type) materials are mentioned in some sites belonging to Middle Dnieper-Donets culture (Nikolsk necropole, Piščiki and Strilicja Skelia sites), (TELEGIN 1968, 192-193; TELEGIN, POTENKHINA 1987, 198). V. SOROKIN (1997, 21-22) related some of this imports with a period ranging from the end of Tripolye A, BI-BII. Also a Dnieper-Donets fragment is mentioned in a Tripolye site, Greblea (TSVEK 1980, 172; SOROKIN 1997, 27); in other site, Grini, of the Dnieper-Donets culture there are noticed Tripolye B I imports (TELEGIN 1968; SOROKIN 1997, 27).

From one of these two cultures, Dnieper-Donets or Sursk-Dnieper, comes a ceramic fragment, mentioned between Prut and Nistre (information V.Sorokin). At the same chronological horizon Y.Videjko connects the first relations with the steppe communities, based on the Luka

Vrubleveckaja

discovery (VIDEJKO 1994, 11), but the author indicates the Skelanska culture, or Srednyi Stog Ib. Some ethnical influences of the Black Sea area are also suggested by the anthropological analysis of the Solonceni skeleton with some analogies in the Maryupol area (MOVŠA 1960, 61; SOROKIN 1994, 70), (Fig.1).

The next chronological level is represented by the Cucuteni culture (4600-3500 B.C.), respectively Tripolye BI-CI (4350-3500 B.C.), when relations with the south and nord-west pontic area become stronger (Fig.2).

Even from the Cucuteni A phase, relations whith Gumelnița would become very powerful, continuing the old ones, that we have just remembered. Cucuteni A phase seems to be very long (4600-4050) and covers the entire evolution of Gumelnița culture A1, A2, B2 phases (maybe 4650-4050). Many Gumelnița sites contain pots or fragments of pots, belonging to Cucuteni A3-4 (Cireșu, Hârșova, Brăilița, Râmnicelu, Carcaliu, Lișcoteanca, Căscioarele, Gumelnița: COMȘA 1987, 81-88; HARTUCHE 1959; 1980; POPOVICI, HAȘOTTI 1989, 293-296; LĂZURCĂ 1991,13-14); in cucutenian sites there were found many other materials of Gumelnița origin, or just vehiculated by this culture, some pot types (*askos*, *rhython*), graphyte painted pottery, plastic representations, objects of bones or shells, Vidra type copper axes, and maybe also some artefacts made of the same raw material (PETRESCU-DÎMBOVIȚA 1966, 23; MARKEVIĆ 1970, 56-58; MONAH 1978, 39; MAXIM-ALAIBA 1984,118; COMȘA 1987, 81-88; MANTU 1998, 135-158). Direct contates with the Gumelnița world or with the Stoicani-Aldeni-Bolgrad are also demonstrated by the Berezovka discoveries, made by E.TSVEK (1996, 109).

In the same period with GUMELNIȚA A2 phase are also appearing the Cernavoda I tribes; the discovery of this two kind of archaeological materials, together with the Cucuteni A3-A4 ones indicate a synchronism (HAȘOTTI, POPOVICI, 1992, 41-42). Penetration of the Cernavoda I communities in the Danube area as well as the extension of the Cucuteni ones in the area of the ex-Stoicani-Aldeni-Bolgrad areal, is possible to have determinated weaker relations or even an interruption of relations with the Gumelnița-Karanovo VI-Kodžadermen world. Cernavoda I communities from the south-east Romania and Bessarabia maintain their relations with the cucutenian world, at the Cucuteni A-B/Tripolye B II level, as it is shown by the archaeological realities (VI. DUMITRESCU

1968, 40; MANZURA 1994, 99; MANTU 1998, 126). It is quite interesting that at this chronological level there are very strong relations with Bodrogkeresztúr/Gornești (H. DUMITRESCU 1961, 69; VI. DUMITRESCU 1976, 356; 1981, 26; VULPE 1964, 457; 1975, II, 42; DUMITRESCU, VULPE 1988, 40; MONAH 1986, 34; MONAH, ICONOMU 1993, 276) and Sălciuța IV-Băile Herculane II-III-Cheile Turzii-Huniadyhalom (VI. DUMITRESCU 1976, 357; 1981, 23-24; MANTU 1998, 126), which could be related also with the copper sources and the trade with such kinds of artefacts. At the Cernavoda Ic level, corresponding to Cucuteni B/Tripolye CI, relations between this kind of communities seem to intensify, this being suggested by the south-eastern Romanian discoveries (Râmnicelu, Pietroasele: DUPOI, PREDA 1977, 6; HARȚUCHE 1980, 13) or by those from Bessarabia (Novo Cotovsc, Cosari, Hadjider: MANZURA 1994, 96). Gradually, one part of the Cernavoda I areal is occupied by Usatovo tribes in the north part of the Black Sea area.

If we turn back to Cucuteni A/Tripolye B I level, at the Cucuteni A3-A4 level, in the steppe area of the Black Sea, or down the Danube and in Dobrogea (maybe also in the north-east Bulgaria) we notice some graves belonging to Suvorovo group (its area seems to correspond to a part of Cernavoda I areal). After Y. Rassamakin, such Suvorovo communities are integrated in the Skelanska culture (evolving between 4500-4100 B.C.). This culture, Skelanska, together with other three ones Stogovska, Kvitanska and Dereivka, belong to Srednyi Stog unit. The first tumular grave apparition between Danube and Dniester is also connected with this cultural unit. Such kind of graves with a rich inventory, contain pottery with broken shells in the paste and with incised decorations which remind us of the Cucuteni A/Tripolye BI and Gumelnița, too (*Ibidem*, 100), stone sceptres, many copper artefacts similar to those from Gumelnița, but also some elements connected with the previous culture in the steppe area of the Black Sea, Maykop (RASSAMAKIN 1994). It seems that the two kind of sceptres, schematical and realistic ones belong to the Suvorovo group (DERGAČEV, SOROKIN 1986). Between Prut and Dniester is the area with the highest density of such kind of artefacts (in Moldavia there are 5 schematical sceptres – Obârșeni 2, Bârlălești, Mogoșești, Ruginoasa – and 2 realistic ones – Fedeleșeni, Fitionești: VI. DUMITRESCU 1955, 925; 1972, 45-51; BRUDIU 1975; BRUDIU, COMAN 1979; DODD-

OPRIȚESCU,

MITREA 1983). This density determines the hypothesis that this kind of artefacts could have also been made by the local cucutenian communities (BURTĂNESCU, ȚURCANU 1997, 76). The suport for this hypothesis could be that the new discovered sceptre from Ruginoasa is made of local stone, as raw material from the Bârgăului Mountains, Maramureș (*Ibidem*, 84); this is quite interesting, taking into consideration that the Berezovka stone sceptre is also made of a local raw material (VIDEJKO 1994, 12; porfirit, information E.TSVEK 1999). Unfortunately, for most of the sceptres we do not know the provenience source of the raw material (GOVEDARITSA, KAISER 1996, 85-98). Such kind of prestige artefacts are connected by some archaeologists as Al. HÄUSLER (1994, 123-126), with older tradition, even mesolithical ones. It is also important to notice that the Eastern Azov Sea sceptres are extended over a larger period equivalent with Precucuteni III/Tripolye A and until Tripolye BII, BII-CI (BURTĂNESCU, ȚURCANU 1997, 81). So that, they might be the source of inspiration for those from the Cucuteni-Tripolye area. In Jora de Sus site (Cucuteni A2/A3-Tripolye BI) the discovered stone sceptre was in association with some ceramic fragments which contained mixed shell and also from the same place is mention a pot with eastern influence (DERGAČEV, SOROKIN 1986, 54-55, fig. 1/6, 7).

More discovered from the Cucuteni-Tripolye area in connction with the Srednyi Stog unit: this kind of pottery which contains crushed shells was found between the Dnieper-Dniester and Dniester-Prut (Solonceni, Florești-Zagorțeno, Jura de Sus, Kadievtsi, Vasilivka, Ruseștii Noi I: SOROKIN 1997, 21; VIDEJKO 1994, 15) but also over the Prut to the west (Berești, Mitoc-*Pârâul lui Istrate*, Scânteia, Fedeleșeni, Drăgușeni-Mitoc: NESTOR, ZAHARIA 1968, 20, fig. 1/2; CRÎȘMARU 1970, 270; 1977; DRAGOMIR 1996, 17-20; MANTU 1998, 121).

For the same chronological level, Tripolye BI, Skelanska type pottery is present in the "east Tripolye" area (Berezovka, Krasnotavka, Chizsovka, Sabatinovka I, Pechera, Cherniavka, Onoprievka: VIDEJKO 1994, 11). In order to reflect the intensity and how strong this relations became after Cucuteni A/Tripolye BI, we remember that such kind of materials are discovered until West Podolian area (SULIMIRSKI 1968, 88).

If we accept that Skelanska/Suvorovo culture evolved between 4500-4100 B.C., which is Y. Rassamakin opinion's, the very next relations

between Cucuteni/Tripolye cultural complex had to be more closed to Stogovska culture (it's chronological evolution is based on Tripolye BII/CI imports from tumular grave Ingren 8), which may cover the period 4100-3600 B.C. Typically for this culture, Stogovska, are pots with pointed end and with so named "caterpillar" decoration. Such kind of decoration is present in the Cucuteni area, at the Cucuteni A-B2 level, in the eponime site (PETRESCU-DÎMBOVIȚA 1966, 17) and more recently in Cernavoda Ib level (Hârșova), too (HAȘOTTI 1995, 27). The frequency of this pottery type, connected with Srednyi Stog unit is growing up till Cucuteni B1, between Carpathians and Prut, but at the end of Cucuteni B2 is decreasing (CUCOȘ 1985, 85). This situation, seems to be similar to the Prut-Dniester interfluvium, where in the period of Cucuteni A-B phase, such kind of pottery with mixed shells is represented between 2-6% (sites from Solonceni aspect), but in Cucuteni B represents only 0,5-1% (SOROKIN 1994, 79).

At the Tripolye BII-CI/Cucuteni A-B, B level, such kind of steppe communities are spreading first on Bug valley and then to the north part of Black Sea area: the new sites of this areal contain tripolian type archaeological material, but many Srednyi Stog type, too (VIDEJKO 1994, 17). In Serezlievka, Bogdanivka, Konstantinovka, Pribugskie settlements of the Nizhnemikailovka culture there are also painted pottery of Tripolye CI type (*Ibidem*, 17). Tripolye imports and the association of archaeological materials from some sites as Sărățeni, graves 1 and 3 (fragments from Cernavoda 1, Ib pots), or those from the Dnieper Basin (Stogovska pottery in Nizhnemikailovka graves) suggest even an earlier dating of this Nizhnemikailovka culture, between Tripolye B II and CI-CII (3700-3000 B.C. or even earlier, Rassamakin 1994, 44), which after my estimation could be 3950/3850-3150 B.C. (MANTU 1998,132).

The relative chronology of the Dereivka culture was established especially on the base of Tripolye imports (from Tripolye BII, BII/CI, CI/CII: RASSAMAKIN 1994, 40) and its absolute evolution seems to have been between 3700-3150 B.C. Despite Rassamakin's opinion, Y.Videjko believes it is contemporary with Tripolye CII (VIDEJKO 1994, 20).

In the north part of the Black Sea, at the late Tripolye level, CII-yll (3500-3150 B.C.), evolves Usatovo group, with 70 sites (settlements, flat necropolises and tumular ones) in a two stages evolution (ZBENOVIC 1974; PATAKOVA 1979; DERGAČEV 1980; PATAKOVA, PETRENKO, BURDO, POLIŠČIUC 1989; MANZURA 1994). In the first stage,

developed on the Vyhvatincy group, there are still a lot of Cernavoda I elements. In the second stage, there are noticed more Cernavoda III elements (in the lower Danube area), but also, other ones, difficult to demonstrate, in connection with Nizbnemikailovka or Srednyi Stog type (MANZURA, SAVA 1994, 150). In this last stage, special graves as those from Bursuceni funerary complex reflect northern influences, from Trichterbecher area; contacts with the Cucuteni/Tripolye complex which start at the Cucuteni A-B level, are still present in the Cucuteni B phase, than extend to northern Black Sea, Azov Sea areas and reach even the Northern Caucasus (*Ibidem*, 171). Famous usatovian type knives reflect also a reorientation of the exchanges to the south, with the Aegean-Anatolian cultures (MANZURA 1994, 10).

Older discoveries also are sustaining a synchronism between early Jamnaja and Usatovo (an early Jamnaja pot is present in Usatovo type grave: PATAKOVA 1979,77-119; TELEGIN, POTENKHINA 1987, 200).

Another group, with late Tripolye elements (Gordinești-Kasperovka), but also with Maykop type ones is the Zhivativka-Volchansk (RASSAMAKIN 1994, 45). After Y. RASSAMAKIN opinion' (1994, 45) this group is a mixture of late tripolian communities in decline, which might be found in the silvo-steppe area, but demonstrate also connections with the Central Europe areal. Other late tripolian communities in decline are mentioned, too in the same area.

From our presentation is possible to observe that the Cucuteni/Tripolye relations with other contemporaneous vicinity communities from the silvo-steppe and steppe of Black Sea area were very dynamic and more intense than those with the west and south-west part of the same areal, or those of its west side areal.

In the last years there are some information for Bulgaria, too. In the second stage of the Galatin culture (Sălcuța IV-Băile Herculane-Cheile Turzii-Hunyadihalom) at Hotnica Vodopata, V. ILČEVA (1993, 83) has mentioned a mixt shell fragment of pot cord decorated, attributed to Cucuteni BI/Tripolye CI. In the same culture there are also houses with platform, as in Cucuteni/Tripolye areal (*Ibidem*). Such kind of relations, even not so strong, could be mentioned also at the Usatovo cultural level, where some imports and imitation after Sălcuța IV-Galatin are present in the Usatovo-Balșoi Baratovsk sites (MANZURA, SAVA 1994, 61).

Very interesting are also some ceramic materials imports, or only

similarities?, attributed to Cucuteni/Tripolye area. In Central Anatolia, at Alişar some ceramic forms (high cup with leg, spheric pots with high leg) remembering of Cucuteni A/Tripolye B I. Some anthropomorphic statuettes from the same Central Anatolia seem to be similar to Cucuteni A-B and B (PARZINGER 1993, 265, fig. 181/3, 15-18 and 205/15-19) and L. THISSEN (1993, 108) is also noticing a pottery close to Cucuteni type.

Lately, there is a new tendency for interpreting the relations between Cucuteni/Tripolye cultural complex and the communities from the steppe and the silvo-steppe area north of the Black Sea. This new tendency is also regarding the role of these communities in the ethno-cultural transformations from the area and of the south-eastern of Balkan Peninsula (MANZURA, SAVA 1994, 173; HÄUSLER 1994; MAKKAY 1994, RASSAMAKIN 1994; LEVIŤKI, MANZURA, DEMCENKO 1996, 93-95; GOVEDARITSA, KAISER 1996, 83). LEVIŤCHI, MANZURA, DEMCENKO (1996, 82-94) believe that the relations of the Cucuteni/Tripolye cultural complex with steppe communities were more active; this direction is connected to the over population process that started at Cucuteni A/Tripolye BI level.

Some archaeologists (ČERNJAKOV 1993, 18-19) put the large extension of Cucuteni/Tripolye complex in connection with their agricultural system. This situation is connected lately with the climatical changes, which determined also modifications in the Black Sea level.

V.G. Petrenko appreciates, on the base of the interdisciplinary research, that Tripolye/Cucuteni moved over the limit of its initial territory in the same rythm with the climatic changes (PATAKOVA, PETRENKO, BURDO, POLIŠČIUK 1989, 117); the end of eneolithic in the north part of the Black Sea coincides with the end of Atlantic period.

Also, Y. VIDEJKO (1994, 16) believes that the appearance and the spread of the Precucuteni/Tripolye A could be connected with a non-favourable situation on the hills of the Carpathian mountains, where this first appeared. The next large spread of the Tripolye BII-CI/Cucuteni A, A-B, B is also connected with a more favourable climatical period which coincides with a more humide phase of the Holocen.

Such kind of climatic changes affected the evolution of the steppes cultures, as well. Y. RASSAMAKIN (1994, 61), taking into account the analysis he made over the cultural features of the cultures from this areal, believes that the beginning of the eneolithic here (Skelanska/Suvorovo

culture) coincides with that of the second part of the Atlantic period (more favourable conditions, related to oceanic climate, with more mild seasons and richer rainfalls). The beginning of the late eneolithic in the steppe is connected by the same author with the passage from Suboreal to the Atlantic. Such events affected the economical structure of both kind of communities Cucuteni/Tripolye and Nizhnemikhailovka, Kvitanska, as well (*Ibidem*, 62).

The steppe cultures, connected with the Cucuteni/Tripolye cultural complex by the presented relations, have on the latest estimations a similar kind of economy, based on agriculture and animal breeding. The food necessity was supplemented by other products, too, from hunting and fishing; the horse was also first used for nourishment and was later domesticated (HÄUSLER 1994, 123-126). Presence of the pigs and other elements from the sites of steppe cultures are arguments for their sedentary character (VIDEJKO 1994, 18).

The strong relations with Cucuteni/Tripolye seem to determine also the improvement of the economy of the steppe communities: some agricultural tools and especially *Triticum monococum* and *dicocum* are used in the Dnieper area after the spread of the Tripolye (*Ibidem*, 18).

The exchange of copper artefacts might play an important role in this kind of relations. Y. Videjko thinks that Srednyi Stog migration might be connected with the existence of the metallurgic center in Balkans (*Ibidem*, 28). Steppes communities have direct relations with Gumelnița and Stoicani-Aldeni-Bolgrad ones, maybe especially because of the copper artefacts. The appearance and spread of the Cernavoda I and the Cucuteni A communities in the ancient area of Gumelnița (and Stoicani-Aldeni, too), as well as the relations with Suvorovo group could have the same reason (MANZURA, SAVA 1994, 151). We just would like to remind that at Cucuteni A-B/Tripolye B II level, relations with Transylvania are strong, maybe in connection with the interest for the copper objects and ores, too.

Some communities from the Srednyi Stog unit were involved, too, in the exchange of prestige objects, in this way realising connection between the steppe area and the agricultural world (RASSAMAKIN 1994, 65). Individual graves and later the tumular graves indicate also influences from the South-danubian areal, in the Cucuteni/Tripolye world, especially from Gumelnița and Varna.

In connection with the exchange and trade between the two areas

on South Bug valley, there must be remind some sites, whose cultural affiliation to Tripolye (Nebelievka and Tomaševka) or Srednyi Stog unit is still under discussion (VIDEJKO 1994, 17).

Other products can be also the subject of exchange or trade: the elegant painted pottery of Cucuteni/Tripolye, as well as the raw material for making tools (silex or other kind of stones) and salt. The role and importance of the salt for the neo-eneolithic economy and especially for the Cucuteni/Tripolye is mention by several archaeologists (ELLIS 1984, 205; MONAH 1991, 396-397; DUMITROAIA 1994, 60-62). We believe it is possible to enlarge this kind of exchange or trade to the west side of the Black Sea communities. The richness of Varna communities was based not only on copper and gold, but also on salt; nearby it is the only salt exploitation of that time and area, in Devnia.

Contacts of the Cucuteni Tripolye communities with the other ones from the vicinity area of the Black Sea determined also the change of the inhumation ritual, and the appearance of tumular graves.

We could assume thath communities mentioned here were involved in a very complex process of trade and exchange, on a large area. New discoveries as well as the entire publication of the old archaeological researches will complete the actual picture of this relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BRUDIU Mihalache

1987 *Două sceptre de piatră descoperite în sud-estul Moldovei*, SCIVA, 38, 2, p.169-179.

BRUDIU M., COMAN Ghenuță.

1979 *Un nou sceptru de piatră descoperit în sud-estul Moldovei*, SCIVA, 30, 1, p. 101-103.

BURTĂNESCU Florentin, ȚURCANU Senica

1997 *Un nou sceptru de piatră eneolitic descoperit în Moldova*, TD, XVIII, p.75-95.

ČERNJIAKOV I.T.

1993 *Mesto Tripol'skoi kultury v drevnejšei istorii Evropi*, Archeologija-Kiev, 3, p.5-19.

CHILDE Vere Gordon

1956 *Anatolia and Thrace. Some Bronze Age relations*, AnSt, 6, p. 27-48.

COMȘA Eugen

1987 *Les relations entre les cultures Cucuteni et Gumelnița*, in: *La*

- civilisation de Cucuteni en contexte européen* (eds. M.Petrescu-Dîmbovița et alii), Iași, 1987, p.81-87.
- 1994 *Contactele dintre comunitățile Precucuteni-Cucuteni-Tripolie cu acelea vecine din ținuturile de la nord și nord-vest de Marea Neagră*, Hierasus, IX, p.295-302.
- CRÎȘMARU Aristotel
- 1970 *Contribuții la cunoașterea neoliticului din împrejurimile Săvenilor (jud. Botoșani)*, SCIVA, 21, 2, p.267-284.
- 1977 *Drăgușeni. Contribuții la o monografie arheologică*, Botoșani.
- CUCOȘ Ștefan
- 1985 *Ceramica de "tip C" din aria culturii Cucuteni*, MemAnt, IX-XI (1977-1979), p.63-92.
- DANILENKO V.N.
- 1969 *Neolit Ukrainy. Glavi drevni istorii jugo-vostočnoi Evropi*, Kiev.
- DERGAČEV Valentin A.
- 1980 *Pamjatniki pozdnego Tripol'ja*, Chișinău.
- DERGAČEV V.A., SOROKIN Victor Ia.
- 1986 *O zoomorphnom skiptre iz Moldavii i proičknovenii eneolitičeskich plemen v Karpato-Dunajskie zemli*, Izvestija, Chișinău, 1, p.54-65.
- DODD-OPRIȚESCU Ann, MITREA Ioan
- 1983 *Sceptrul de piatră de la Mogoșești-Siret, județul Iași. Problema originii și datării*, Carpica, 15, p.69-95.
- DRAGOMIR Ion T.
- 1996 *Monografia arheologică a Moldovei de Sud. I*, Danubius, XVI.
- DUMITRESCU Hortensia
- 1955 *Afinități între cultura Trichterbecher și cultura Cucuteni-Tripolie*, SCIV, 6, 3-4, p.913-923.
- 1955a *Șantierul arheologic Traian (1954)*, SCIV, 6, 3-4, p.459-478.
- 1961 *Connections between the Cucuteni-Tripolie Cultural Complex and the Neighbouring Eneolithic Cultures in the Light of the Utilisation of Golden Pendants*, Dacia, N.S., 5, p.69-93.
- 1976 *Două vase de o formă deosebită descoperite în așezarea de la Traian-Dealul Viei*, MemAnt, IV-V (1972-1973), p.47-54.
- DUMITRESCU Vladimir
- 1955 *Cîteva precizări cu privire la sceptrele în formă de capete de cal din RPR și din URSS*, SCIV, 6, 3-4, p.925-934.
- 1968 *Considerații cu privire la poziția cronologică a culturii Cucuteni în raport cu culturile vecine*, Apulum, VIII/1, p.35-50.
- 1972 *Din nou despre sceptrele de piatră în formă de cap de cal*, Pontica, V, p.45-51.
- 1976 *Probleme privind sincronismele unor culturi eneolitice*, SCIV,

-
- 27, 3, p.355-362.
- 1981 *Însemnări în legătură cu unele sincronisme*, MemAnt, VI-VIII (1974-1976), p.23-36.
- 1984 *Cucuteni, cents ans après*, Dacia, N.S., 29, p.35-43.
- DUMITRESCU VI., VULPE Alexandru
- 1988 *Dacia înainte de Dromichete*, București.
- DUMITROAIA Gheorghe
- 1994 *Depunerile neo-eneolitice de la Lunca și Oglinzi, jud. Neamț*, MemAnt, XIX, p.7-82.
- DUPOI Vasile, PREDA Florentina
- 1977 *Cîteva observații preliminare ale cercetărilor arheologice de la "Gruiul Dării", comuna Pietroasele, jud. Buzău*, AUB, Istorie, 26, p.5-12.
- ELLIS Linda
- 1984 *The Cucuteni-Tripolye Culture. A Study in Technology and the Origins of Complex Society*, BAR-Int. Series, 217, Oxford.
- ESIN Ufuk
- 1993 *Gelveri. Ein Beispiel für die kulturellen Beziehungen zwischen Zentralanatolien und Südosteuropa während des Chalkolithikums*, Anatolica, 19, p.47-56.
- GIMBUTAS Marija
- 1992 *Chronologies of Eastern Europe: Neolithic through Early Bronze Age*, in: *Chronologies in Old World Archaeology*³ (ed. R.W.Erich), Chicago, London, vol.I, p.395-406; vol.II, p.364-384.
- GOVEDARITSA Blagoje, KAISER Elke
- 1996 *Die äneolithischen abstrakten und zoomorphen Steinzepter Südost- und Osteuropas*, Eurasia Antiqua, 2, p.59-103.
- HARȚUCHE Nicolae
- 1959 *Săpăturile de la Brăilița*, Materiale, V, p. 221-229.
- 1980 *Importuri cucuteniene în mediul culturilor eneolitice din zona Brăilei, Vrancea*. Studii și comunicări, III, p.9-26.
- HAȘOTTI Puiu
- 1991 *La culture néolithique Hamangia. Quelques remarques sur le stade actuel de recherches*, in: *Le Paléolithique et le Néolithique de la Roumanie en contexte européen* (eds.V.Chirica and D.Monah), Iași, p.250-265.
- 1995 *Culturile pre-tracice în Dacia pontică*, PhD thesis-abstract, București.
- HAȘOTTI P., POPOVICI Dragomir
- 1992 *Cultura Cernavoda I în contextul descoperirilor de la Hîrșova*, Pontica 25, p.15-44.

- HÄUSLER Alexander
- 1994 *The North-Pontic Region and the Beginning of the Eneolithic in South-East and Central Europe*, in: *The Archaeology of the Steppes. Methods and Strategies. Paper from the International Symposium held in Naples 9-12 November 1992* (ed. Bruno Genito), Napoli, p.123-147.
- ILČEVA V.
- 1993 *Localités de période de transition de l'énéolithique à l'âge de bronze dans la région de Veliko-Tirnovó*, in: *The fourth millenium B.C., Proceeding of the International Symposium, Nessebăr 1992* (ed. P.Georgieva), Sofia, p.82-98.
- LARINA Olga
- 1994 *Neoliticul pe teritoriul Republicii Moldova*, TD, 15, p.41-66.
- LĂZURCĂ Elena
- 1991 *Ceramica cucuteniană în contextul așezării gumelnițene de la Carcaliu (jud. Tulcea)*, Peuce, 10, p.13-17.
- LEVIŢKI Oleg, MANZURA Igor V., DEMČENKO Tatjana
- 1995 *Necropola tumulară de la Sărățeni*, București.
- MAKKAY János
- 1993 *Pottery links between late neolithic cultures of the NW Pontic and Anatolia and the origins of the Hittites*, Anatolica, 19, p.117-128.
- 1994 *Nomades and Invasions from the steppe from an Indoeuropean Perspective*, in: *The Archaeology of the Steppes. Methods and Strategies. Papers from the International Symposium held in Naples, 9-12 November 1992*, Napoli, p.149-165.
- MANTU Cornelia Magda
- 1997 *Cultura Cucuteni. Evoluție, cronologie, legături*, Piatra Neamț.
- MANZURA Igor V.
- 1990 *Perechodnyi period ot eneolita k epoche bronzy v Nižnem Podnestrovie i Poprutie*, Leningrad.
- 1994 *Culturi eneolitice în zona de stepă*, TD, 15, p.93-101.
- MANZURA I.V., SAVA Eugen
- 1995 *Interacțiuni "est-vest" reflectate în culturile enolitice și ale epocii bronzului din zona de nord-vest a Mării Negre (schiță cultural-istorică)*, MemAnt, XIX, p.143-192.
- MARKEVIČ Vesevolod I.
- 1970 *Mnogoslojnoe poselenie Novye Rusežti I*, KSIA, Moskva, 123, p.55-68
- 1974 *Bugo-Dnestrovskaja kultura na territorii Moldavii*, Chișinău.
- 1981 *Pozdnye Tripol'skie plemena severnoj Moldavii*, Chișinău.
- MARINESCU-BÎLCU Silvia
- 1974 *Cultura Precucuteni pe teritoriul României*, București.
- 1976 *Relații între culturile Precucuteni și Boian-Gumelnița*, SCIV, 27, 3,

- p.347-354.
- 1981 *Ţirpeşti. From Prehistory to History in Eastern Romania*, BAR-Int. Series, 107, Oxford.
- 1991 *Sur quelques problèmes du néolithique et de l'énéolithique à l'Est de Carpates Orientales*, Dacia, N.S., 35, p.5-59.
- 1993 *Les Carpates Orientales et la Moldavie*, in: *Atlas du néolithique européen*, vol. 1 (*L'Europe Orientale*), ERAUL 45, Liège, p.191-241.
- MAXIM-ALAIIBA Ruxandra
- 1984 *Locuința nr.1 din faza Cucuteni A3 de la Dumești (Vaslui)*, AMM, V-VI (1983-1884), p.99-148.
- MONAH Dan
- 1978 *Datarea prin C¹⁴ a etapei Cucuteni A*, SCIVA, 29, 1, p.33-42.
- 1986 *Topoare de aramă și bronz din județele Neamț și Bacău*, MemAnt, XII-XIV (1980-1982), p.31-40.
- 1991 *L'exploitation du sel dans les Carpates Orientales et ses rapports avec la culture Cucuteni-Tripolye*, in: *Le Paléolithique et le Néolithique de la Roumanie en contexte européen* (eds. V. Chirica and D.Monah), Iași, p.387-400.
- 1992 *Villages de la civilisation de Cucuteni-Tripolie en Roumanie. Typologie et organisation interne*, in: *Habitat et l'occupation du sol à l'Âge du Bronze en Europe*, Paris, p.391-406.
- MONAH D., ICONOMU Constantin
- 1996 *Topoare de aramă din Moldova*, ArhMold, 16, p.275-277.
- MOVŠA Tatjana
- 1960 *K voprosu o tripol'skich pogrebenjach s obrjadom trupopoloženja*, in: *Materialy i issledovania po archeologii jugo-zapada SSSR i Rumynskoj Respubliki*, Chișinău, p. 59-76.
- NESTOR Ion, ZAHARIA Eugenia.
- 1968 *Sur la période de transition du néolithique à l'âge du bronze dans l'aire des civilisation de Cucuteni et de Gumelnița*, Dacia, N.S., 12, p.17-43.
- ÖZDOGAN Mehmet
- 1993 *Vinča and Anatolia: A new look at a very old Problem*, Anatolica, 19, p.173-193.
- PARZINGER Hermann
- 1993 *Studien zur Chronologie und Kulturgeschichte der Jungstein-, Kupfer- und Frühbronzezeit zwischen Karpathen und Mittleren Taurus*, Mainz am Rhein.
- PATAKOVA E.F.
- 1979 *Usatovskoe poselenie i mogilniki*, Kiev.
- PATAKOVA E.F., PETRENKO V.G., BURDO N.V., POLIŠČUK L. JU.
- 1989 *Pamjatniki tripol'skoi kul'tury v Severo-Zapadnom Pričernomorja*, Kiev.

Mircea

1997 *Cucuteni*, București.

POPOVICI Dragomir, HAȘOTTI Puiu

1989 *Considerations about the synchronism of the Cernavoda I culture*, Pontica, 21-22, p.291-296.

RASSAMAKIN Y.Y.

1994 *The main directions of the development of early pastoral societies of northern pontic zone: 4500-2450 BC (Pre-Yamnaya cultures and Yamnaya culture)*, in: *Nomadism and pastoralism in the circle of baltic-pontic early agrarian cultures: 5000-1650 BC*, Baltic-Pontic Studies, vol. 2, p.29-70.

ROMAN Petre

1963 *Ceramica precucuteniană din aria culturilor Boian-Gumelnița și semnificația ei*, SCIV, 14, 1, p.35-50.

SOROKIN Victor I.

1998 *Culturile eneolitice din Moldova*, TD, 15, p.67-92.

1997 *Considerații referitoare la așezările fazei Cucuteni A-Tripolie B1 din Ucraina și Republica Moldova*, MemAnt, XXI, p.7-84.

SULIMIRSKI Tadeusz

1968 *Corded Ware and Globular amphorae north-east of the Carpathians*, University of London, The Athlone Press, p.52-96.

TELEGIN D.YA.

1968 *Dnipro-Donec'ka kul'tura*, Kiev.

TELEGIN D. YA., POTENKHINA I.D.

1987 *Neolithic Cemeteries and Population in the Dnieper Basin*, BAR-Int. Series, 383, Oxford.

TELEGIN D.YA., TITOVA E.N.

1993 *La zone des steppes*, in: *Atlas du néolithique européen*, vol.1 (*L'Europe Orientale*), ERAUL 45, Liège, p.463-494.

TEZCAN B.

1958 *Aksaray Cevresinden Derlenen Eserler*, Belleten, 22, p.517-526.

THISSEN Laurens

1993 *New insight in Balkan-Anatolian connections in the late chalcolithic: old evidences from the turkish Black Sea litoral*, AnSt, 43, p.207-237.

TITOVA E.N.

1983 *O svjazjach dnepro-doneckoj i bugo-dnestrovskoj neolitičeskich kul'tur*, in: *Drevnosti stepnogo Podneprov'ja III-I tys do n.e.*, Dnepropetrovsk.

TSVEK Ekaterina

1980 *Tripol'skie poselenija Bugo-Dnestrovskogo meždureč'ja (K voprosu o vostočnom areale kul'tury Kukuteni-Tripolje)*, in: *Pervobytnaja archeologija – poiski i nachodki*, Kiev.

1996 *Structure of the Eastern-Tripolie culture*, in: *Cucuteni aujourd'hui* (eds. Gh.Dumitroaia, D.Monah), p.89-113.

URSULESCU Nicolae, BOGHIAN Dumitru

- 1996 *Influences méridionales dans la phase finale de la civilisation Précucuteni*, communication held within the International Symposium *La vie au Bas-Danube il y a 6500 ans*, București.

VIDEJKO M.J.

- 1994 *Tripolye-Pastoral contact. Facts and character of the interactions: 4800-3200 BC*, in: *Nomadism and pastoralism in the circle of baltic-pontic early agrarian cultures 5000-1650 BC*, Baltic-Pontic Studies, vol. 2, p.5-28.

VULPE Alexandru

- 1964 *Cu privire la cronologia topoarelor de aramă cu brațele în cruce*, SCIV, 15, 4, p.457-462.

- 1975 *Die Äxte und Beile in Rumänien*, vol. II, PBF, München.

ZBENOVIC V.F.

- 1974 *Pozdnetripol'skie plemena severnogo Pričernomorja*, Kiev.

- 1989 *Ranij etap tripol'skoj kultury na territorii Ukraini*, Kiev.

