

**MINISTERUL EDUCAȚIEI, CERCETĂRII, TINERETULUI ȘI SPORTULUI
UNIVERSITATEA “1 DECEMBRIE 1918” DIN ALBA IULIA
DOMAIN HISTORY**

SUMMARY

ADVISER

Prof. PhD Valentin Vasiliev

DOCTOR CANDIDATE

Liviu Marta

ALBA IULIA

2010

**MINISTERUL EDUCAȚIEI, CERCETĂRII, TINERETULUI ȘI SPORTULUI
UNIVERSITATEA "1 DECEMBRIE 1918" DIN ALBA IULIA
DOMAIN HISTORY**

***CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE
BRONZE AGE AND THE BEGINNING OF THE
HALLSTATTIAN AGE IN CÂMPIA SĂTMĂREANĂ
AND ȚARA OAȘULUI***

(PhD abstract)

ADVIRSER

Prof. PhD Valentin Vasiliev

DOCTORAL CANDIDATE

Liviu Marta

ALBA IULIA

2010

CONTENTS

	Pages
I. INTRODUCTION.....	2-4
I. 1. Geographical Background	
I. 2. History of Research	
II. SUCIU DE SUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL CULTURE. SETTLEMENTS FROM PETEA AND LAZURI.....	4-7
III. LĂPUȘ II-GÁVA I HABITATION HORIZON. SETTLEMENTS FROM PETEA AND LAZURI.....	7-9
IV. GÁVA II HABITATION HORIZON. SETTLEMENTS FROM CĂLINEȘTI-OAȘ AND LAZURI.....	9-12
V. CHRONOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	12-13
VI. CATALOGUE OF THE LATE BRONZE AGE AND EARLY HALLSTATTIAN AGE DISCOVERIES. CÂMPIA SĂTMAREANA AND ȚARA OAȘULUI.....	14
VII. SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	15-17

I. INTRODUCTION

I. 1. Geographical background. Câmpia Sătmăreană and Țara Oașului belong to the administrative unit from the north-eastern half of the County of Satu Mare. The south-western limit of the territory under research is the confines of the Ecedea Marsh – which is an extended area of the floodplain of Crasna river and one of the greatest marshes from the intra-Carpathian area. Ecedea Marsh was the natural border between the Suci de Sus and Cehăluț-Hajdúbagos communities. Towards the south-west, this territory has a natural boundary that is Culmea Codrului (Făgetului Mountains), a mountain ridge which is situated between Câmpia Sătmăreană and Platforma Sălăjană. During the Middle Bronze Age, Culmea Codrului used to be the border between the territories settled by the Suci de Sus and Wietenberg cultures. During the Late Bronze Age, its role of cultural border grew weaker. Culmea Codrului ridge is narrow and not very tall that makes it easy to pass across. Its bordering valleys (Someș and Crasna Valleys) used to be important ways of communication over time between Transylvania and Câmpia Tisei. In north-east and north, the ranges of the Oaș and Gutâi Mountains mark out the natural border of the area under research, which, in prehistory, was not acknowledged as cultural border. The same cultural phenomena are observed in both sides of the Romanian border with Hungary and Ukraine that is the north-western limit of the territory under research.

The main geographical units are represented by: Câmpia Sătmăreană, the Oaș – Gutâi Mountain range, Depresiunea Oașului and the northern slope of the Culmea Codrului Mountain. The plateau and the basin areas were usually flooded by the main rivers that pass them across: Someș and Tur. The mountains bordering the investigated area are not high. The Oaș – Gutâi Mountains appear as volcanic necks, and Culmea Codrului looks like crystalline rocks.

The archaeological data, the pollen and bone analyses point to an intense habitation in the areas where the marsh, plateau and hill ecosystems meet. An important issue in choosing the place to settle was the wide range of resources that was offered by various ecosystems. Meadows and marshes ecosystems were very attractive to settling in spite of the impending risk of flooding, traces of which were discovered on the lower valley of the Someș river, in the settlements at Culciu Mare and Petea-Csengersima.

I. 2. History of Research. The first discoveries that were made in Câmpia Sătmăreană and Oaș area dating from the period we are referring to here, are represented by bronze pieces and bronze hoards of which we have information beginning with the second half of the 19th century. These pieces have been published by J. Hampel. The collections hosted in the museums of Carei (dating from 1889 and 1890) and Satu Mare (1901) helped keeping the pieces in their home area. The first archaeological excavation was carried out by J. Míhálík in 1892 in the Suci de Sus fortified settlement at Boinești. At the beginning of the 20th century, a monograph of the Satu Mare County was being drawn up therefore A. Vénde carried out archaeological excavations into this sense in the settlement at Medieșu Aurit-Ciuncaș and would speak of other ten Bronze Age settlements in the territory of Câmpia Sătmăreană. The following period was devoid of archaeological excavations till 1964, though there were made remarkable discoveries of bronze hoards (Apa, Bătarci, Vetiș) and were identified locations of

settlements. With the 1964 excavations carried out in the Suciul de Sus settlement from Medieșu Aurit, Tiberiu Bader started an extensive Bronze Age research program which focused on studying the Suciul de Sus culture in Câmpia Sătmăreană.

History of Research of the Suciul de Sus Culture. Investigations in the Suciul de Sus archaeological culture began in the last decades of the 19th century in Lăpuș Basin and were carried out by J. Szendrei and M. Roska. They have drawn out the first reports on this culture in several studies that were published in the last decades of the 19th century and in the first decades of the 20th century. At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, archaeological excavations were carried out in north-western Hungary, mainly in the western area of the Ukrainian Carpathians. The assessment of the entire area covered by this culture was done much later when A. Mozsolics and N. Kalicz published two studies in 1960. They broadly dated this culture to the Late Bronze Age and outlined its spreading map: north-eastern Hungary, north-western Romania and the Trans-Carpathian Ukraine. There was an issue that would generate confusions in future research that is the fact that they would operate with discoveries from north-eastern Hungary, which is a typically inter-cultural area, where Suciul de Sus materials were found together with other specific materials of the neighbouring archaeological cultures. A first attempt to analyse the differences observed in the Nir area was made by T. Kemenczei and T. Kovács by classifying the Berkesz-Demecser cultural group as a cultural synthesis comprising of three constituents: Suciul de Sus elements, barrows (Egyek) and an eastern element (Noua-Komarovo). It has been recently established that besides a typically mixture of the interference region, the north-eastern Hungarian area can be awarded to different cultures (Suciul de Sus and Cehăluț-Hajdúbagos), but the eastern element though has been overstated.

With the beginning of the seventh decade and hitherto, the Suciul de Sus culture has been intensely investigated in three points: Câmpia Sătmăreană and Oaș (T. Bader), Maramureș with focus on Lăpuș and Valea Sălajului area (C. Kacsó) and Trans-Carpathian Ukraine (F. M. Potușneak, E. Balahuri, V. Vasiliev și J. Kobal'). These investigations revealed important data about the development of the culture and its specific elements. Although at first the Suciul de Sus culture was considered an Ottoman-Wietenberg synthesis that was generated at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age, T. Bader has suggested an origin in the Nir culture (Early Bronze Age). Now, what P. Roman and J. Némethi have stated seems better grounded: the Suciul de Sus culture emerged within a broader phenomenon which was represented by region divisions and separations within the wide spreading of the Ottoman communities.

The researches that were carried out in the area under the Suciul de Sus culture have captured the existence of some evolution stages. The first suggestion came from A. Vulpe who believed in the existence of three phases within the development of this culture's pottery beginning with the present stage in the eponymous necropolis and ending with the necropolis at Lăpuș. Assuming the principle of development in pottery decoration from incision to excision, T. Bader has proposed three evolutionary phases. Based on the same principle, C. Kacsó has suggested a two-phase division, giving up on the intermediary phase proposed by T. Bader (Culciu Mic) and considering that the necropolis from Lăpuș point to the existence of a distinct cultural group. The last evolutionary scheme has been proposed by J. Kobal'. His three-phase division (Stanovo I-III) comprised C.

Kacsó's two phases to which he has added a new phase contemporary of Lăpuș group.

Researches of the Suciul de Sus culture did not manage to solve important issues about the development and precise dating of the evolutionary stages. The small quantity of published materials and the lack of a consistent analysis of the characteristics of each phase can explain the different opinions, sometimes antithetical, about the genesis of the culture, its development and relations with the neighbouring societies or about its end and the traditions that the Suciul de Sus culture bequeaths.

History of Research of the Early Hallstattian Age. Compared to the rich investigation of the Suciul de Sus culture, much reduced was the interest for studying the cultural horizon with fluting pottery dating from the Late Bronze Age and the Early Hallstattian Age. This situation appears to be more unusual as in the bordering areas – north-eastern Hungary, Lăpuș Basin, Crișana, the Trans-Carpathian Ukraine and Câmpia Careiului – were carried out important researches that focused on the development of the Gáva culture or the cultural groups preceding it. New archaeological researches have shown that Câmpia Sătmăreană, like the neighbouring areas, comprised of two cultural horizons that were using black-brick-red pottery decorated by fluting:

1. The first settled horizon, which I called Lăpuș II-Gáva I (I used an old name which has also been recently used by J. Némethi) were under extended research in the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri. That horizon also comprised other settlements in the area: Botiz, Corod, Dorolț etc. Its specific materials have close analogies to the discoveries from the 2nd phase of the Lăpuș group and to Gáva I discoveries from Carei area and north-eastern Hungary.
2. The second horizon, which I called Gáva II, matches a full-grown stage within the Gáva culture. Within Câmpia Sătmăreană, this phenomenon was researched in the fortified settlement from Călinești-Oaș and in the open settlement from Lazuri, being also known in other points like: Apa, Medieșu Aurit etc. The archaeological materials that were found here have analogies in the sites all over the spreading area of the Gáva culture.

Identifying two distinct cultural horizons with typically fluting pottery in Câmpia Sătmăreană was possible due to long time researches in the wide territory where that type of pottery was used. At first, the entire fluting, black-brick-red pottery was assigned to the Gáva culture, so as next to be used under new conditions in the areas or stages of its wide spreading territory.

The sites and materials investigation that led to the identification of the Lăpuș II-Gáva I cultural horizon was carried out in four areas: Depresiunea Lăpușului, Sălaj valley, the area in north-eastern Hungary and Câmpia Careiului. The most intense researches were carried out in the first of the regions, where C. Kacsó has defined Lăpuș group as an independent group that developed during the Late Bronze Age, based on the researches from the eponymous necropolis. He also concluded that the Lăpuș II-Gáva I cultural group was present in Sălaj valley. For the other two regions - where scanty excavations were made – the publication and interpreting of materials of the Gáva I type could have been done based on the investigations undertaken by T. Kemenczei and J. Némethi. The pottery groups resulted from these regions have many focal points that become clearer by comparing them to the pottery from Satu Mare area which is geographically comprised among these areas.

Unlike other areas where the Gáva culture is considered an intrusive phenomenon, the Satu Mare area – and widely the upper Tisa Basin – is considered the birth place of the Gáva culture. To establishing the location and the dating of the Gáva sites (phase II), an important role had the researches carried out in the sites with complex stratigraphy within the cultures: Somotor (J. Paulík), Mediaş (E. Zaharia, C. Pankau), Mahala (G. Smirnova) and Teleac (V. Vasiliev, I. A. Aldea, H. Ciugudean). Through comparative analysis with materials from the layers of these settlements (especially Mahala), A. László succeeded in outlining two stages of development for the Gáva sites in Moldavia. Even though correlations have been made with the materials from Teleac, in Banat setting distinct phases of evolution was not possible (M. Gumă), as well as in the case of the Tisa Plateau (G. V. Szábó). In a recent analysis of the discoveries from Mediaş area, C. Pankau has also observed the existence of two sequences within the Gáva culture. Through a parallel analysis of the Gáva I discoveries in north-eastern Hungary (contemporary of Lăpuş II phase) with the discoveries that belong to the Mahala III – Grăniceşti – Mediaş I – Somotor I – Teleac I (– Reci I – Tuşnad) sequence, C. Pankau has joined different cultural aspects in one phase, even though their development run in two chronological stages.

II. SUCIU DE SUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL CULTURE. SETTLEMENTS FROM PETEA AND LAZURI

II. 1. Settlements. The settlements from Petea-Csengersima – Vama and Lazuri – Lubi Tag are located in Câmpia Sătmăreană, at 9 km from each other. Both are set on mounds in the Someş floodplain.

The settlement from Petea-Csengersima was estimated to spread on a surface of 11-12 ha. The topsoil was removed from a surface of about 4 hectares and the research units spread over a surface of 7,8 hectares. The Suci de Sus archaeological features (phase III/ Bader, phase II/ Kacsó) gathered into two areas, on both sides of the Erge brook. The pits from the westernmost part of the site (on the Hungarian territory) cut into a Middle Bronze Age layer. A clay layer on top of the Middle Bronze Age settlement shows no continuity from one habitation horizon to another. The central part of the site (close to the state border) comprised only prehistory features that belonged to the Suci de Sus II phase (Kacsó). In the eastern part of the site, on the Romanian territory, the Suci de Sus features lowered in frequency while the Lăpuş II-Gáva I features increased in number. The Romanian territory of the site uncovered a cultural layer buried right beneath the arable soil, being 0,15-0,35 m thick. The layer contained artefacts and daub platforms which were assigned to two successive habitation sequences: Suci de Sus II and Lăpuş II-Gáva I. Archaeological excavations and surface sondages could establish the north and east borders of the settlement, the latter remarking itself through ritual vessel depositions and one bronze hoard.

The surface of the Settlement from Lazuri was estimated to an area of 5,6-6,6 hectares, out of which only a surface of 0,4 hectares was submitted to research. Each

research unit contained a cultural layer that was 20-30 cm thick. Like in the case of the settlement at Petea-Csengersima, the cultural layers contained Suciú de Sus II materials (Kacsó) and materials with analogies in the 2nd phase of the Lăpuş group and the 1st phase of the Gáva culture. The settlement from Lazuri also comprised Gáva II archaeological features which cut into the cultural layer.

II. 2. Archaeological Features. The dwellings that were found in the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri have two types: semi-subterranean and surface buildings, both types of construction also being familiar in other sites of this archaeological culture. At Petea-Csengersima was found one semi-subterranean dwelling and two of them in the settlement at Lazuri. They appeared like two large-sized pits that went as deep as 55-75 cm below present ground level. As their investigation was not completed, in two cases, the interpretation of their function remained uncertain. It is clearer that feature 22 from Petea-Csengersima was a dwelling, as it had post holes in both uncovered corners as well as other three were located along one side of the construction. The corners of the dwelling were oval resembling the typical shape of construction in western Carpathian Ukraine.

Two surface dwellings were identified in the settlement from Petea-Csengersima and four of them in the settlement from Lazuri. They appeared like daub platforms, well preserved, with no damage due to subsequent constructions (two dwellings, in Lazuri). Their dimensions (4,50x5 m and 3,20x4,50) came near to those registered at the dwellings from Culciu Mare. Some of the daub platforms that were partially uncovered were large-sized, which fact attests the existence of some dwellings with large areas, like the ones from Oarța de Jos or in the western Carpathian Ukraine. Lacking a clear system of post holes disposal in the case of the Suciú de Sus buildings makes impossible to establish their surface. There is the particular case of dwelling 43 from Lazuri where the hearth was preserved, however there were hearth fragments all over the pieces of fired clay from all houses. Similarly, like in Suciú de Sus settlements, no dwelling, of the ones mentioned here, preserved *in situ* objects.

The numerous pits from both settlements have been classified into categories. Three pits were only excavated down to the cultural layer and were identified based on the vessels found in them. There were six bell-shaped pits, but other numerous pits with arched walls seem to be the lower part of some bell-shaping features. They functioned as storage pits, which fact can be argued by their neat form and bottomless vessels. The fill of the storage pits contained domestic waste. Another category of pits was represented by 28 cylindrical, flat-bottomed pits. Some of them were meant to store supply, but in pit S10cx4 from Petea-Csengersima was laid a tapered, bulged vessel, beautifully decorated. Both settlements recorded irregular-shaped pits. Two of them, large-sized, were considered to be pits used for clay extraction. Both settlements had small-sized pits, most being post holes. There were only three situations of all, which were met at Petea-Csengersima, in which the restoration of some building perimeters was possible starting from holes layout.

II. 3. Archaeological Material. The rich pottery groups originating from the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri have opened the possibility of a re-evaluation of the catalogue containing vessel shapes and decorative motifs from the late Suciú de Sus phase. The previous analyses on this culture's pottery have only provided general conclusions that contained references to pottery forms, decoration techniques and several decorative motifs.

The database (Zeus) containing all vessels types, sub-types and variants together with a wide range of decorative motifs has offered the possibility to assess their frequency within the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri (for the first time

on the Suciú de Sus culture). The database records only the vessels from the archaeological features with a clear classification, given the numerous pottery forms found in the layer with no certain cultural affiliation. Establishing associations and comparing the frequency of each pottery allowed determining the role each vessel type had and the decorative motifs typical of the pottery from the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri. Thus, comparing vessel types and decorative motifs of the pottery found in different archaeological sites of the Suciú de Sus culture becomes easier to determine where the two settlements stand within the evolution of the culture.

For more efficiency, the database has been divided into gradual typologies: general forms, types, sub-types and variants. Thus, there have been recorded 783 vessel forms from the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and 359 vessels from the settlement in Lazuri. The most frequent five forms of vessels found in each settlement were: pots, cups, bowls, tapered-bulged vessels and portable cooking-vessels. A low frequency occurred in the case of: storage vessels, trays, lids, embers protector caps, bowls and spoons. The typological analysis has established characteristics of types, sub-types and variants, based on the transformations they were submitted to during the evolution of the Suciú de Sus culture.

It has been analysed every decorative motif which was present on the Suciú de Sus pottery and have been determined analogies with other Suciú de Sus sites and neighbouring cultures. In order to organize the decoration analysis, one has divided into groups the decorative motifs starting from processing techniques and main decorative themes that were applied to pottery.

Two moulds were found in the settlement from Lazuri, of which one preserved the trace of a spear tip and the other wore the mark of a shaft-hole chisel. The bronze pieces that were found in the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri were as follows: five scythes (three were buttoned, two were fragmentary), one bracelet, one buckle ring, one horseshoe-shaped pendant, four disc-headed needles with knobs and one head-twisted needle. The disc-headed needles formed a ritual deposit. Many clay objects were found in the two settlements: clay weighs spindle-whorls, cart wheels, spoons, one button / pendant, animal (cattle) protome, a bird-like representation and a clay foot / boot. Stone pieces were represented by grinders and crushers (present in both settlements) and by two axes that were found in the settlement at Petea-Csengersima. The settlement from Lazuri unearthed two bone objects: one awl and a holed pig eye-tooth that had been used as pendant.

II. 4. Conclusions. Following materials and features research carried out in the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri one can draw a few observations about their operating period and their position within the developing period of the Suciú de Sus archaeological culture, respectively. These observations are grounded on the large quantity of archaeological materials that were found in archaeological features. Creating a database highlighted the characteristics of the archaeological material from the two settlements.

Scythes, the pendant and the bronze bracelet from Lazuri date back to the Late Bronze Age, but more often they occurred in the Uriu-Ópályi hoards. Typically of this type of hoards are the disc-headed needles with knobs that were found in the settlement at Petea-Csengersima. The pieces from the two settlements make the connection between their lifespan and the Reinecke BzD sequence that is a late period of the Suciú de Sus culture. The results of their analyses have brought out the possibility that the lifespan of the two settlements exceeded Bz D phase.

The database including pottery from the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri helped determining clear similarities between vessel shapes and decorations on pottery from both settlements. They operated at the same time with the Culciu Mare settlement which is demonstrated by the fact that each of the vessel forms and nearly every pottery decoration of this settlement are registered in the pottery catalogue of the Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri settlements. However, it has been established that a large number of vessel forms and decorations from the settlements at Culciu Mic and Boinești were absent from the pottery at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri (cups, mugs with turban-shaped body, tureens with arched neck, incised decorations, pots with socketed belt vessel rims decorated by “wheat grain”-impressed band, spirals with filled inter-spaces framed by two parallel, oblique lines). The second category of vessels from the settlements at Boinești and Culciu Mic show an intermediary form between Suci de Sus I vessels (Bader) and pottery from the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri. It has also been observed that some vessel forms and many decorations on the pottery from Petea-Csengersima were new, as they lacked from the pottery at Culciu Mic and Boinești. Comparing the pottery of the two settlements has brought out the existence of a hiatus during their evolution.

The chronological gap between the end of the settlements from Culciu Mic and Boinești and the beginning of the settlements at Petea-Csengersima, Lazuri and Culciu Mare appears to be covered – from the perspective of pottery development – by several sites of the Suci de Sus II phase (Kacsó) which contained specific pottery elements for both settlements (settlements at Oarța de Jos – Vâlcea, Rusului, Bicaz – Igoaie, Diakovo and Kvasovo). One button originating from a bronze bracelet which was found in the Kvasovo settlement and two Cypriot needles found in the settlements at Oarța de Jos and Bicaz relate the development of the settlements where they were found to a previous stage of the Uriu-Ópályi hoards. Based on the discovery of the two needles, C. Kacsó has questioned the existence of several chronological differences between some sites dating from the Suci de Sus II phase, which differences he thought could not be proved from the perspective of pottery evolution. The results of pottery analyses from Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri yielded the existence of several differences between sites of the Suci de Sus II phase (Kacsó). In this respect, the evolution of the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri could rely on a late Suci de Sus II stage (Kacsó) which fact – besides the dating of bronze pieces – has concluded that the evolution of these settlements was rather close to the settlements from the Reinecke Bz D sequence (however admitting a possible beginning in the Bz C or an ongoing process at the beginning of the Ha A).

Researches from Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri provided new elements related to organizing the space inside the Suci de Sus settlements. Four ritual depositions that were gathered in the eastern side of the settlement at Petea-Csengersima have raised the possibility of using the border area of the Suci de Sus settlements as deposition area (situation attested by two bronze hoards at Kvasovo and one at Csaszló). Regarding the activities carried out in the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri, elements were found which attested the following activities: cereal cultivation, husbandry (osteological analyses), metallurgy, trading activities and religious-ritual activities.

LĂPUȘ II-GÁVA I HABITATION HORIZON. SETTLEMENTS FROM PETEA AND LAZURI

III. 1. Settlements. The settlements of the Lăpuș II-Gáva I horizon from Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri were located in archaeological sites besides the late Suci de Sus culture. Given their close chronology, the relation between the two habitation horizons has become very important.

In the settlement from Petea-Csengersima, all archaeological features (except one ritual pit) that belonged to the Lăpuș II-Gáva I habitation horizon were located in the eastern side of the site, in the north-east of the Erge brook. The number of the Lăpuș II-Gáva I features progressively increased towards the eastern margin of the site concurrent with the decrease of the Suci de Sus features. The eastern side of the site unearthed six dwellings attributed to Lăpuș II-Gáva I habitation horizon. The archaeological features of that habitation covered an area of 1,5 hectares (100 x 150 m). Only the western and northern borders of the settlement have been investigated, its overall surface being estimated to 3 – 3,75 hectares. The archaeological Lăpuș II-Gáva I features at Lazuri overlapped one side of the settlement over a length of 135 m. The length of the settlement has been estimated to 150-175 m, with no data provided about its width.

As shown before, in the areas covered by features of the Lăpuș II-Gáva I habitation from the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri, the cultural layer contained typically materials and archaeological features from both habitation horizons. One could not differentiate the levels of the cultural stratum, but one could only observe that the daub platforms of the Lăpuș II-Gáva I habitation were situated in its uppermost level.

III. 2. Archaeological Features. The settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri uncovered the remains from nine constructions that were likely to function as dwellings. Six houses were found at Petea-Csengersima. Five of them were represented by daub platforms originating from surface dwellings and one was a semi-subterranean building. The surface constructions in Lazuri were represented by the remains of two fired dwellings and by the foundation ditches of a large-sized construction. The daub platforms were compact, being composed of charred walls ranging from 15 to 25 cm in thickness. The only dwelling that was completely uncovered was S15x1 from Petea-Csengersima. The surface of its daub platform – 7,63 square metres (2,18 x 3,50 m) – was modest. However, the possibility that the two preserved post holes originate from the posts located on the central axis of the dwelling is eligible, in which case the surface of the house would be double than the one of the daub platform. The surface of dwelling 49 from Lazuri has been estimated to 22,2 square metres. The existence of large-sized buildings was attested by the presence of several large-sized daub platforms, which even partially unearthed, covered areas of 37,5 and 41 square metres. The traces in the clay point to the fact that when erecting a building, posts with rounded or flat sides had been used, poles and twigs, respectively. An oval-shaped hearth (67 x 88 cm) was found in the area of a small-sized, daub platform likely to originate from a dwelling of the Lăpuș II-Gáva I horizon. Among the remains of other dwellings were only found fragments that originate from unusable hearths.

The settled area of Lăpuș II-Gáva I horizon from Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri uncovered similar types of pits with the ones from the Suci de Sus habitation: bell-shaped pits (13), cylindrical pits (10), amorphous pits (2) and small-sized pits. There were also pits with arched walls that were possibly the lower part of some bell-shaped

pits. The bell-shaped pits and most cylindrical pits have been considered storage pits. Their function was emphasized by the presence on some of their bottoms of vessels/ vessel fragments that used to store supplies. Most pits contained in their fill household waste, that being probably after they had been disused. One pit was excavated up to 3,94 m in depth and it is likely to had been a well, but its cultural classification is still uncertain. Three cylindrical pits – two at Petea-Csengersima and one at Lazuri – were ritual pits. They contained vessels and grinders, whole or fragmentary. One has thought the amorphous pits had been dug in order for extracting clay, and at least some of the small-sized pits were post holes.

III. 3. Archaeological material. The pottery of Lăpuș II-Gáva I settlement from Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri was less than that of the Suciul de Sus habitation. They are important to identifying a new habitation horizon in Câmpia Sătmăreană which would have developed throughout the Late Bronze Age, in the period between the end of the Suciul de Sus culture and the Gáva culture (with characteristics of the 2nd phase). Identifying this cultural horizon has been favoured by many common elements which the pottery of this horizon has with the pottery of the Lăpuș II and Gáva I phases. The pottery analyses of the Lăpuș II-Gáva I habitation have focused on comparing it with the pottery of the neighbouring cultures, as well as they have tried to capture possible connections with the Suciul de Sus pottery, which appeared in both settlements. In the settlement from Lazuri one tried to detect possible links (continuity/ cessation) with the Gáva II pottery, which developed subsequently from this settlement. The presence in the settlements under research of some inhabited areas dating from close periods of time, whose pottery have several common features with the Lăpuș II-Gáva pottery, has led us to considering only the pottery from the archaeological features. There were identified 375 vessels in the archaeological features at Petea-Csengersima and 197 in Lazuri, differing in shapes or decoration. Regarding the paste type they had been made of, three categories have been established: fine, semi-fine and coarse. With respect to the firing method, it has been observed that only 7,34% of the vessels from the two settlements had been fired until they became shiny-black on one side and brown or brick-red on the other. In order to be able to introduce a greater number of vessel fragments and be efficient in using the database, the following division has been made: types, sub-types and variants. The most frequent pottery forms that have been identified are: tureens/ bowls, cups, pots and tapered-bulged vessels. A low frequency registered strainers, lids, trays and embers protector caps (the last form has uncertain cultural classification). For a better organizing of decoration analysis, the decorative motifs have been divided into groups, beginning with the processing techniques.

The settlements at Lăpuș II-Gáva I, Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri uncovered the following metal pieces: a Baierdorf knife, a Rigsee knife, a needle with seal-shaped head, a needle with knobbed neck, an awl and a buckle ring. Clay objects were only represented by weighs, and stone objects by grinders and one whetstone.

III. 4. Conclusions. The archaeological researches at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri revealed a new cultural horizon in Câmpia Sătmăreană that developed after the Suciul de Sus culture had ended and before the expansion of the Gáva culture, which corresponds to the building up of the great, fortified Hallstattian settlements inside the Carpathians. The similarities between the materials within the neighbouring areas (discoveries of the Lăpuș II and Gáva I type) allowed their classification to a broader culture ongoing in the Upper Tisa Basin, Câmpia Someșană, Câmpia Nirului and in northern Transylvania (Depresiunea Lăpușului and Valea Sălajului). The cultural material from these regions comprised many common elements defined by

characteristics that separate them from neighbouring areas. Furthermore, there are many regional particularities among the micro-zones mentioned above which the pottery analyses showed them as a result of inherited traditions. The bronze pieces with greater chronological relevance are represented by a needle with seal-shaped head that was found in Lazuri and a Baierdorf knife, found in Petea-Csengersima. Both pieces are specific of the Reinecke Bz D and Muller Karpe Ha A1 sequences. The dating period of the knife from Petea-Csengersima is supposed to have covered a shorter span, especially focused on the last of the phases because the Baierdorf knives only occurred in the Ciuncu-Suseni/ Kurd hoards. The analyses of types, sub-types, variants and decorative motifs have been targeted to finding similarities with the pottery from the cultural groups of the Late Bronze Age. It has been established great affinity between many forms from Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri and the vessels of the Lăpuş II group or the Gáva I type. There have also been registered inherited objects from the Suciul de Sus culture and pottery fragments that were forwarded to the Gáva II culture.

The pottery from the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri closely relate to the bronze objects from the Ciuncu-Suseni/ Kurd hoards. Their link can be traced in two directions. The first direction is represented by two vessel forms from these settlements that appeared in the in Ciuncu-Suseni/ Kurd hoards.

The second direction leads to analogies of the pottery from the settlements from Satu Mare with pottery from cultural environments or archaeological sites that were closely related to the bronze hoards from the Ciuncu-Suseni/ Kurd series or their characteristic material. Pottery analysis showed that the overall shapes and decorations specific of the Lăpuş II-Gáva I phase from Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri compare well with Lăpuş II pottery. The differences between them are restricted only to the occurrence of single vessels or their scanty appearance. Two forms from Lăpuş make the exception, as they appeared in a great number within the necropolis: two-handled small vessels and a cup variant with upraised handle that was taller than the usual form in Satu Mare. Most of the pieces presented above that belong to the two forms yielded in the necropolis at Lăpuş – of whose evolution in the Lăpuş II phase we have no information – have buttoned handles, suggesting a Transylvanian influence (Noua). They have many common elements, but the differences between them lie in the features of the coarse pottery (grooves frequency and the presence/absence of socketed ribs).

Its comparison with the Gáva I pottery has been made by referring to the pottery from the area of Carei (Bervenii and Carei), given the fact that it has many more forms than have been published compared to the sites in north-eastern Hungary. Common shapes and decorations are many; the elements from the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri which are absent from Carei area, are mostly forms and decorations with low frequency or elements inherited from the Hajdúbagos-Cehăluţ characteristics. The settlement from Carei has been related to the Ha A stage through a Ciuncu-Suseni/ Kurd bronze hoard. To the same period of time were assigned most bronze pieces of the Lăpuş II phase. The similarity between Lăpuş II-Gáva I pottery and the one from Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri signal their dating to the Ha A phase – which dating has been pointed out by the chronology of the Baierdorf knife that was found in the Petea-Csengersima settlement. The broad-span used in dating some types of bronze hoards and the occurrence of some pieces in both Uriu-Ópályi hoards and Ciuncu-Suseni/ Kurd bronze hoards, have provided the beginning of Lazuri and Petea-Csengersima settlements – and Lăpuş II-Gáva I habitation horizon – ambiguous, so as they can't be dated for certain at the end of the Bz D phase or the

beginning of the Ha A sequence. On the other hand, because the Ha A2 stage was insufficiently represented by bronze pieces or specific bronze hoards, has made difficult to assess their end to a certain moment in the Ha A phase.

Researches at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri have brought out several new elements regarding the organizing of the settlement, namely the activities that were practised in Lăpuș II-Gáva I habitation horizon. In the settlement at Petea-Csengersima, dwellings were gathered in a small area (6 houses have been clearly classified and 3 have doubtful award). Regarding the position of ritual pits in both sites, we observed that they were located at the border of the Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri settlements. This was an ongoing habit since the Suceu de Sus culture, which was also present in the case of some vessel or bronze depositions. In the case of the Ha A horizon they were laid in the border of the settlements from Nagykovács, Carei and Kvasovo. Regarding the activities that had been carried out in the settlements at Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri, have been identified several elements pointing to plant cultivation, husbandry (based on osteological analyses), weaving and spinning, as to some religious-ritual activities.

GÁVA II HABITATION HORIZON. SETTLEMENTS FROM CĂLINEȘTI-OAȘ AND LAZURI

IV. 1. Settlements. The settlement at Călinești-Oaș was a fortified settlement that covered an area of 7 hectares that is the overall plateau of Hurca Hill. Being situated on the western side of the Oaș Mountains, Hurca Hill is strategically located at the entrance in Depresiunea Oașului. Most sides of the hill have a high degree of slope, even steep slopes in places. Its height ranges between 12 and 23 m above ground level. Intense agriculture that is being carried out in Călinești-Oaș has largely affected the inhabited area and the defensive settlement of the archaeological settlement. Archaeological excavations (21 research units) have targeted outlining the direction and the way the defence wall was built, as well as researching preserved areas in the settlement.

The defence of the settlement from Călinești-Oaș was provided by a wall which was investigated in the northern and eastern sides of the settlement in order to find out its method of construction. The wall was made of earth and was provided with two stone backings. The stone backings have been preserved on a height of 20-40 cm and a width of 0,60-1,10 cm. The palisade has been attested by the presence of many fragments of charred wood nearby the wall. The palisade also provided two circular post holes, with 35-40 cm in diameter, located in front of the outer wall-back, in trench S7. The distance between the post holes was 38 cm. A neighbouring trench revealed larger distances between posts, of over 1,20 m.

Walls provided with stone backings (one or two) are attested in several Gáva and Kjatice fortifications in Slovakia, in north-eastern Hungary and in western Carpathian Ukraine. Regarding the defensive system consisting of stone backing walls, the settlement from Călinești- Oaș provided the geographical connection between the group of settlements in the Upper Tisa Basin and the ones in eastern Transylvania (Ciceu-Corabia, Bodoc, Tușnad). These fortifications were located along the range of the Northern and Oriental Carpathians which fact has pointed out tight connections between methods of constructions used in building fortifications and the accessible materials. The volcanic tuff was easily extracted, reason for which it was used in

building really long walls (1-2 km) that sometimes used to surround the entire settlement perimeter. Arranging stones like wall-backings supported by spaced posts encouraged to using fewer straight and long tree trunks for the palisade. There was a similar situation existent in the settlement at Călinești-Oaș where the spaced post holes of the wall were illustrated by the presence of stone wall-backings.

In the north-eastern corner of the settlement were uncovered the traces of a gate opposite to a narrow way which provided easy access to the plateau. After the wall withdrew inside and the entrance direction changed to the front wall, a narrow space grew between the gate and the edge of the slope, which would turn awkward the attacking strategies from the gate.

The settlement at Lazuri lacked fortification and the archaeological features were spread over a surface of 140 x 62 m. The surface extended over a surface of at least 7,5 hectares, which fact has been proved by the results of the investigations carried out upon a Roman Age tumulus in the western site and the materials gathered from the ground surface. Deepened features of the Gáva II type cut into the Late Bronze Age cultural layer, however only two fragments of daub platforms – located in the same area – have been preserved in the upper part of the cultural layer where it met the arable layer.

IV. 2. Archaeological Features. A semi-subterranean dwelling was found in every settlement, but surface dwellings were found four at Călinești-Oaș and two in the settlement at Lazuri, respectively. The semi-subterranean dwelling S31 cx35/Lazuri had a pronounced oval shape and dwelling S5L2/ Călinești with right-angled south-eastern corner appears to have been rectangular. The fill of both features contained a large quantity of daub which points to the fact that their walls had been clayed, applied right on twigs and beams. They were 60-80 cm deep, thus enter the category of cottages, which type has been frequently met in Gáva-Holíhrady cultural environment. Surface dwellings have been preserved under the shape of daub platforms. The apparent absence of post holes or a scarcely researching of a few dwelling fragments provide insufficient ground for a clear assessment of their ground-plan. Lacking post holes is a frequent phenomenon in the case of Gáva-Holíhrady buildings.

Regarding pit shapes, the following division has been submitted: beehive-shaped pits (4), cylindrical pits (3), irregular pits/ amorphous pits (7), small, post holes (2). The neat form and flat bottom of the first two categories of pits suggest that their purpose was to store products or objects.

IV. 3. Archaeological Material. Gáva II pottery was scanty. There were 433 pottery forms identified in Călinești-Oaș and 207 in Lazuri, the same pottery types like in other settlements of the culture, respectively. Bi-chrome firing (black-red) reached 45,96% in Călinești-Oaș, that was a higher percentage than the previous habitation had. Types, sub-types, variants and decorative motifs have been established in accordance with the ones identified in other Gáva settlements. The pottery from Călinești-Oaș, which is also to be found in the archaeological features from Lazuri, is closely related to the pottery from Grănicești, Mahala III, and at a lower rate to the pottery from Teleac I and Mediaș I sequences. The other features from the settlement at Lazuri contained pottery that is also to be found in Teleac II, Mahala II and Mediaș II sequences, or in other sites of the late Gáva culture.

IV. 4. Conclusions. Gáva settlements from Călinești-Oaș and Lazuri have not provided metal pieces from a tight dating. In this respect, the only piece depicting chronology was the large-sized celt that was cast in the pattern from Călinești-Oaș (pl. 113/5). It was larger-size than the small samples that are specific of the Ha B2 and Ha

B3 phases. The dating of the two settlements had to begin with the pottery analysis that was found in them.

The analogies of pottery shapes and decorations pointed to a close similarity of the materials from Călinești-Oaș and from several archaeological features in Lazuri (S25cx24, S25cx24a, S31cx35, SVgr.196) with materials found in Mahala III sequence and Grănicești settlement. In the case of a group of elements, have been established connections between them and the first levels from Teleac and Mediaș. The common elements with Mahala III sequence and Grănicești settlement are: the main role played by variant 1A within the tapered-bulged vessels category, the absence of pots with socketed belt and the high presence of bowls with thickened interior rim (variants 1B and 2B). Bowls with inverted rim playing a minor role have been limited to variant 3B (narrow, inverted rim). Bowls and tureens decoration is only one: flutings and horizontal facets, wide shouldered flutings/ elongated facets (HA motif); the latter had higher frequency. The similarity with Teleac I has been attested by the presence on cups and necks of tapered-bulged vessels of the decoration depicting garland-shaped fluting with a band of horizontal flutings above it. Typically of the early Gáva (II) culture is the absence of some pottery forms and especially of a broad category of decorations (to be mentioned below) that will have emerged in the Teleac II and Mahala IV phases.

The fortified settlement at Călinești-Oaș and the group of early features from Lazuri can be dated after Lăpuș II–Gáva I manifestations ceased to exist. The first were closely related to Ciuncu-Suseni/ Kurd (Ha A1) hoards. By establishing their relation with the Mahala III–Grănicești–Teleac I–Mediaș I horizon has been assumed the dating of the settlement at Călinești-Oaș and early Gáva II features from Lazuri to a late Ha A phase and during the Ha B1 phase.

Materials that have been awarded to a late Gáva culture simply originate from a rather small number of features from Lazuri. Some of these features were very rich in archaeology. They lacked some of the specific pottery of the early phase and the presence of new ones in them has provided grounds to assigning them to an early phase of the Gáva culture. New pottery is represented by: bowls with pronounced inverted rim (variant 3A), a broad range of decorations including the socketed belt on pots, and especially new methods of decorating bowl rims (to the prejudice of facets/ oblique-elongated flutings) -, short, oblique flutings (HC and HD), broad flutings descending on the exterior side to the limit of the maximum diameter (HE). New decorative motifs appeared on the inside vessels: the band with horizontal flutings (IA), star-decoration (IC) and “false rivets” (ID). These forms and decoration were to be found in many other settlements beside metal pieces dating from the Ha B-C stages or the late phase of the Gáva culture in Câmpia Tisei, Transylvania and northern Moldavia. The presence of these forms and decorations beginning with Teleac II and Mahala IV sequences have provided their awarding to a late phase of the Gáva culture. When dating the late phase of the Gáva culture from Lazuri, one should think of a possible beginning in the Ha B1 period and going on until sometime during the Ha B2-B3 period. The small number of features from Lazuri couldn't provide a clear lifespan of the settlement. Gáva culture in Câmpia Sătmăruului ended when the Mezőcsát culture emerged during the Ha B3 phase. Besides the bronze hoard from Vetiș, the presence of this cultural group has been little investigated.

The activities that were carried out in Gáva settlements from Călinești-Oaș and Lazuri which have been provided with archaeological documentation are: plant cultivation, husbandry, metallurgy, weaving and spinning.

CHRONOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The archaeological investigations presented in this paper cover the development of the habitation in Câmpia Sătmăreană and Țara Oașului beginning with the Late Bronze Age (BzC/D and HaA) and continuing throughout the Early Iron Age (HaB). Three cultural phenomena developed in the area of Câmpia Sătmăreană and Țara Oașului during that period: the Suciu de Sus culture, the cultural group of Lăpuș II-Gáva I and the Gáva culture (the late phase II).

Suciu de Sus Archaeological Culture. The results of the analyses made on the materials found in the settlements from Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri have revealed that those settlements functioned in a late phase of the culture, in a period that matches the final stage of the Suciu de Sus culture. Comparing them with the archaeological materials of the culture itself uncovered some differences within pottery, which actually are regional particularities and they represent different chronological moments in the evolution of the culture. Through their general characteristics, the pottery of the two settlements under discussion here offer several elements for a re-evaluation of the Suciu de Sus culture beginning with its early phase of development. This comes to round-up the internal evolution suggested by T. Bader and C. Kacsó.

The researches carried out in the settlements at Halmeu and Medieșu Aurit have shown that during the *Suciu de Sus I phase* (Bader and Kacsó) the pottery from Câmpia Sătmăreană became specific due to the small rate presence of the grooving pottery. The analysis of the pottery from the Petea-Csengersima and Lazuri settlements has revealed that the Suciu de Sus II phase (Kacsó) can be divided into two sub-phases.

Suciu de Sus IIa Sub-phase. Its beginning is marked by excised decoration. It is represented by the end of the settlements from Boinești and Culciu Mic, and Oarța de Jos-Vâlcea Rusului, Bicaz-Igoaie, Diakovo and by the second level of the settlement from Kvasovo II. The pottery from these sites revealed elements existing since the Suciu de Sus I phase, but it was also represented by a series of specific elements of the sites. Some of the pottery forms of this phase make the transition from the Suciu de Sus I phase to the Suciu de Sus IIb phase. The bronze pieces from the Suciu de Sus IIa phase are comprised in the Koszider type hoards, but with a longer life span than this type of hoard, still not reaching the period of the Uriu-Ópályi burial hoards. The dating of the Suciu de Sus IIa phase broadly matches the Reinecke BzB2 and BzC phases.

Historically speaking, we can state that the Suciu de Sus IIa sub-phase emerged in times of fluster and cultural transformations visible in its north and west and in south (Transylvania). In north, the Ottoman and Füzesabany cultures ended when the Hajdúbagos-Cehăluț emerged. The most prominent element in the course of changes in this area was marked by the end of the economic and social system represented by the tell-type settlements from Câmpia Tisei. Profound changes happened at the same time inside the intra-Carpathian Transylvania. The Suciu de Sus communities from the Upper Tisa area were not affected by this fluster. On the contrary, they took advantage of this situation by settling on territories towards south and north. Towards

south and south-east, the communities of the Suciul de Sus IIA phase settled (to the prejudice of the Wietenberg culture) areas from Sălaj valley, the middle Someş basin, reaching up to Lăpuş Basin. It is uncertain if up to this troubled times they had already entered nearby the confluence area of the Someşul Mare river with the Someşul Mic river, while the settlement at Căşei was dated to a later period (in the Bz D sequence). The moment when the Suciul de Sus culture extended towards north and north-west is not yet clear. The presence of import vessels with excised decoration in an early phase of the Piliny culture suggested that the extension will still have happened in the Suciul de Sus IIA phase. Inside the area covered by the Suciul de Sus culture the differences between the Satu Mare area and the eastern areas dominated by this culture continued to exist, the grooving pottery having an important role in the new areas covered by the Suciul de Sus archaeological culture in the south and south-east sides.

Suciul de Sus IIB Sub-phase is represented by the settlements at Petea-Csengersima, Lazuri and Culciu Mare. As it has been afore-mentioned, the pottery of these settlements comprised several types of vessels and many decorative motifs which lacked from several sites assigned to the Suciul de Sus IIA sub-phase, or they could simply represent an advanced form of pottery. The pottery found in those settlements was the main characteristic of the recent chronological sequence. That was the time when emerged the low cup (Type 4) and the black-red bi-chrome pottery; elements that would become characteristic of the cultural horizon following the Suciul de Sus culture (Lăpuş II-Gáva I). The close similarities between the Suciul de Sus IIB phase and the Reinecke BzD sequence are to be found in the associations made between this phase and the bronze objects of the Uriu-Ópályi hoards (Petea-Csengersima, Lazuri, Culciu Mare, Nyírkarász-Gyulaháza, Rozsály, Căşei). The researches at Petea-Csengersima revealed elements that prove a parallel development of the Suciul de Sus IIB discoveries from Câmpia Sătmarului with the ones of the Lăpuş I phase that were to be found in the south-eastern area.

The genesis of the *Lăpuş II-Gáva I cultural horizon* is part of a complex process that took place in a wide intra-Carpathian area: the beginning and wide-spreading of using the fluting, „black-red” pottery. Independent of other regions, in the Tisa plateau, this process happened at the end of Bz D and Ha A1 sequences. In the upper Tisa region, this new cultural horizon came out in new pottery forms and decorations that were clearly distinct from the neighbouring cultures: Igriţa or Biharea (Bihar region and Depresiunea Şimleului), pre-Gáva (middle Tisa area) and discoveries of the Cugir-Band type (Transylvania). The main characteristics of the upper Tisa pottery are: tapered-bulged vessels with a single row of knobs whose decoration lies in wide fluting or ribbing, several types of bowls with thickened internal rim decorated by facets or horizontal futings (never oblique), low cups with upper-raised handle, decorated by bosses (type 4). Besides these features, the regions in the upper Tisa area have much more common vessel forms and decorations. If we only refer to the better know areas - Depresiunea Lăpuşului, Câmpia Careiului and Câmpia Sătmăreană - it becomes clear that each vessel type or decorative motif usually appeared in every region, and if not so, in at least two of them. Actually, the wide areas dominated by: the Cehăluţ-Hajdúbagos cultural group, the Suciul de Sus culture (phase IIB) and the Lăpuş cultural group (phase I) were submitted to a natural process of cultural unification. The specific pottery of the Satu Mare area has many similarities with the pottery from the two neighbouring areas, even more it stands many common elements between the Gáva I sequence (Nir area, of Hungary and Carei area, of Romania) and the Lăpuş II phase (Depresiunea Lăpuşului and Valea

Sălajului). The cultural material from the Satu Mare area mirrors its intermediary geographical position, that is between the area assigned to the Lăpuș II phase and the Gáva I area. Even though all these microregions have several typical elements, they are not able to stand an individual, cultural development because of their shallow consistency. They have decorated, coarse pottery which date way back in time and are being called “ancestral” elements, however each of the microzones had inherited them since the late stage of the Middle Bronze Age.

Gáva II Phase. The archaeological researches that were carried out in the settlements at Lazuri and Călinești-Oaș showed that the second phase of the Gáva culture (the classical stage) emerged in Câmpia Sătmăreană and Depresiunea Oașului through specific elements for its entire spreading area. The new stage is characterized both by gaps and common elements with the Lăpuș II- Gáva I horizon. Most settlements of the new cultural horizon were located on different places than those of the Lăpuș II- Gáva I habitation. Building the surrounding fortification from Călinești-Oaș showed that the new culture expressed its characteristic feature since its early existence.

Comparing the materials of the Gáva II settlement from Satu Mare with those from other Gáva sites (especially the sites at Mahala, Teleac, Grănicești and Mediaș) uncovered that the area of Câmpia Sătmăreană was home to two Gáva II habitation horizons: Gáva IIa phase (Călinești-Oaș and some features from Lazuri) and Gáva IIb phase (most features from Lazuri).

Once the Gáva II phase began, clear elements emerged that were typically of the Lăpuș II- Gáva I ones. Their particularity was obvious even if we speak of a continuous use of the fluting, “black-red” pottery. First of all, there was a significant, quantitative increase of the bi-chrome pottery (from 7,34% to 45,96%). Furthermore, there were some major changes registered in shapes and decorative motifs, most of the new ones being specific of the entire area covered by the Gáva culture.

Beside new shapes and decorations, there were ongoing elements of traditional pottery that are well clear if one compares the early Gáva II pottery from Câmpia Sătmăreană to the pottery from other sites assigned to the early Gáva culture. Some of the latter attest for certain the heritage of the local pottery characteristics (the lack in socketed belts on the pots from Călinești-Oaș and especially the frequent use of the bowls with thickened internal rim). By these elements, Satu Mare pottery resembles the early Gáva pottery from Bucovina (Mahala III and Grănicești). The varying presence of the grooving pottery might be interpreted as a legacy of traditions from different micro-regions (Satu Mare, Lăpuș and Maramureș regions). The fact that some elements were preserved from the previous local specific (from the lower valley of Mureș and from Banat) has been pointed out in the case of the early Gáva settlements in the southern Transylvania (Teleac I and Mediaș I). Several pieces of pottery from the young Gáva culture were specific of the first level from the two sites (Teleac I and Mediaș I). The analogies of the Gáva IIa pottery of the Satu Mare area meet the results of the previous researches of both the ways influences arrived and gave birth to the Gáva II culture and the ways the culture developed. In order to make its connection to the Mahala III–Grănicești–Teleac I–Mediaș I horizon is necessary to date the Gáva IIa sequence from Câmpia Sătmăreană to the times after the Lăpuș II- Gáva I habitation ceased to exist, that is to a late period of the Ha A phase and during the Ha B1 phase.

Recent features from Lazuri uncovered that some specific forms and decorations of the Gáva IIa sub-phase were lacking and signaled the presence of new ones. Assigning new pottery to a late phase of the Gáva (IIb) culture has been possible by

observing their presence in the late layers of some settlements with complex stratigraphy (Mahala IV, Teleac II, Mediaş II). Their late dating has been also possible because they were found in sites besides hoards or bronze and iron objects dating from Ha B1-B3.

Once these elements appeared, Gáva pottery became increasingly homogeneous. Many forms and decorations have disappeared from the cultural groups of the Bz D-Ha A period. Those transformations could have been the result of some changes that took place in metallurgy. In the Ha B1-B2 period, the number of bronze hoards from the intra-Carpathian Transylvania considerably increased compared to those from the Upper Tisa region. This, together with the importance Transylvania region earned in what concerns processing famous metal pieces (especially during the Ha B2 stage) suggests the existence of a powerful centre of metallurgy within the intra-Carpathian area. The importance of the metallurgical centre is also attested by the increasing number of iron objects in Transylvania, a moment which met the beginning of the period characterised by Teleac II and especially Teleac III levels. During this period, in the Upper Tisa Basin and the area of Bucovina, new pottery emerged and old pottery traditions were abandoned (Gáva IIa). A cessation of pottery evolution has been observed in each settlement that was heavily researched. The cessation of the settlements from Mahala (3rd level) and Grăniceşti also happened in Călineşti-Oaş. In the case of the last settlement mentioned here, its end occurred violently as it has been attested by the fire at the defensive system from the north-eastern gate. Without pushing too far the interpretations of the archaeological research, I would say that the archaeological material points to a chronological link between the end of these settlements and the changes that occurred in Gáva metallurgy and pottery. The new settlements that emerged in the Tisa Basin and in northern Moldavia (Mahala IV, Siliştea Nouă) were characterized by homogeneous pottery that was specific of the entire cultural area which no longer held on traditional elements. All this yield the possibility that in these regions Gáva culture was divided into two sub-phases: Gáva IIa and Gáva IIb. In dating the late Gáva settlement from Lazuri, one can think of its likely beginning in the Ha B1 period, but it also developed throughout an unknown span in the Ha B2-B3 phases. The end of the Gáva culture in Câmpia Sătmăreană has been awarded to the appearance of Mezőcsát cultural manifestations, during the Ha B3 phase. Except the bronze hoard from Vetiş, the presence of this cultural group is hitherto little outlined.

VI. CATALOGUE OF THE LATE BRONZE AGE AND EARLY HALLSTATTIAN AGE DISCOVERIES. CÂMPIA SĂTMĂREANA AND ȚARA OAȘULUI

The recorded discoveries are meant to set within a geographical (regional) context the archaeological investigations carried out at Petea-Csengersima, Lazuri and Călineşti-Oaş. The catalogue of the Suciul de Sus discoveries comprises 35 archaeological points, all settlements, except one funeral discovery. The discoveries catalogue of the Lăpuş II- Gáva I habitation horizon comprises 8 points, all settlements, except the ritual depositions (funeral?) from Călineşti-Oaş-Horburi. The finds dating from the Gáva II phase are represented by 14 settlements, of which only the settlement from Călineşti-Oaş was fortified. There are five situations in which Lăpuş II- Gáva I settlements overlapped other Suciul de Sus (phase IIb) settlements, and only one situation in which a Gáva II (phases IIa and IIb) settlement overlapped a Lăpuş II- Gáva I dwelling.

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bader 1972: T. Bader, *Cultura Suciului de Sus în nord-vestul României*, SCIV, 23/4, 1972, p. 509-536.
- Bader 1978: T. Bader, *Epoca bronzului în nord-vestul Transilvaniei. Cultura pretracică și tracică*, București.
- Bader 1996: T. Bader, *Neue Bronzegefunde in Nordwestrumänien*. În: (ed. T. Kovács) Studien zur Metalindustrie im Karpatenbecken und den benachbarten Regionen. Festschrift für Amália Mozsolics zum 85. Geburtstag, Budapest, p. 265-301.
- Bader–Dumitrașcu 1970: T. Bader – S. Dumitrașcu, *Săpături arheologice la așezarea de tip Otomani de la Medieșul Aurit. Les fouilles archéologiques dans l'établissement de type Otomani de Medieșu Aurit*, Materiale, 9, p. 127-136.
- Bader–Lazin 1980: T. Bader – Gh. Lazin, *Mărturii arheologice din județul Satu Mare*, Satu Mare.
- Balahuri 1969: E. A. Balahuri, *Новейшие памятники Фельшевской культуры на территории Закарпатской области УССР*, МФМЭ, 2, p. 61-68.
- Balahuri 1972: E. A. Balahuri, *Šelestivske gorodišče-pamiatka naselenia ranniozaliznoi dobe Zakarpattia*, în Doslidjenia starodavnioi istorii Zakarpattia, Užgorod, p. 9-75.
- Balahuri 2001: E. A. Balahuri, *Население Верхнего Потисья в эпоху бронзы*, Ужгород.
- Bejinariu 2003: I. Bejinariu, *Noi descoperiri ale culturii Suciului de Sus în județul Sălaj. New Discoveries Belonging to the Suciului de Sus Culture from Sălaj County*, Marmăția, 7/1, p. 65-81.
- Bejinariu 2008: I. Bejinariu, *Stadiul cercetării epocii bronzului și primei epoci a fierului pe teritoriul Sălajului*, Satu Mare StCom, XXII/1, (2005), p. 93-98.
- Boroffka 1994: N. Boroffka, *Probleme der jungbronzezeitlichen Keramik in Ostungarn und Westrumänien*. În: (editor H. Ciugudean and N. Boroffka) The Early Hallstatt Period (1200-700 B. C.) in South-Eastern Europe, p. 7-23. Symposium Alba Iulia 10-12 iunie 1993, p. 7-23.
- Boroffka 1999: N. Boroffka, *Probleme der späten Otomani-Kultur. Kultura Otomani-Füzesabony-rojwój, chronologia, gospodarka. Materiały z konferencji archeologicznej-Dukla, 27-28.11.1997*, Krosno, p. 113-130.
- Borovsky 1908: S. Borovsky (editor), *Szatmár vármegye*, Budapest, 1908.
- Chidioșan–Emödi 1982: N. Chidioșan – I. Emödi, *Grupul cultural Igrîța de la sfârșitul epocii bronzului*, Crisia, 12, p. 61-86.
- Ciugudean 1994: H. Ciugudean, *The Hallstatt A Period in Central Transylvania*, În: (ed. H. Ciugudean and N. Boroffka) The Early Hallstatt Period (1200-700 B. C.) in South-Eastern Europe. Symposium Alba Iulia 10-12 iunie 1993, Alba Iulia, p. 25-40.
- Demeterová 1984: S. Demeterová, *Influence de la culture de Suciului de Sus dans la plaine de la Slovaquie orientale*. SlovArch, 32, p. 11-74.
- Emödi 1997: I. Emödi, *Descoperiri de la sfârșitul epocii bronzului din Peștera Ungurului (jud. Bihor). Bronzezeitliche Entdeckungen von Peștera Ungurului. Kreis Bihor*, AMN, 34/I, p. 485 – 504.
- Feurdean 2004: A. Feurdean, *Palaeoenvironment in Romania during last 15000 years*. Stockholm.
- Furmánek–Veliačik–Vladár 1999: V. Furmánek – L. Veliačik – J. Vladár, *Die Bronzezeit im slowakischen Raum, Rahden/Westfalia*.
- Gogâltan 2001: F. Gogâltan, *The Settlement of Cășeiu and Some Problems Concerning the Late Bronze Age in the Center and Northern Transylvania*. În: (ed. C. Kacsó), Der nordkarpatische Raum in der Bronzezeit. Symposium Baia Mare 7-10 Oktober 1998, p. 191-214.

- Gogâltan–Isac 1995: F. Gogâltan – A. Isac, *Die spätbronzezeitliche Siedlung von Cășeiu (I)*. EphNap, 5, p. 5-26.
- Gumă 1993: M. Gumă, *Civilizația primei epoci a fierului în sud-vestul României*. BiblThrac, IV, București.
- Hänsel 1976: B. Hänsel, *Beitäge zur regionalen und chronologischen Gliederung der älteren Hallstattzeit an der unteren Donau*, Bonn.
- Hochstetter 1981: A. Hochstetter, *Eine Nadel der Noua-Kultur aus Nordgriechland. Ein Beitrag zur absoluten Chronologie der späten Bronzezeit im Karpatenbecken*, Germania, 59/2, p. 239-259.
- Horedt 1966: K. Horedt, *Așezarea fortificată din perioada târzie a epocii bronzului de la Sighetu Marmăției*, Baia Mare.
- Kacsó 1975: C. Kacsó *Contributions à la connaissance de la culture Suciú de Sus à la lumière des recherches faites à Lăpuș*, Dacia, 19, p. 45-68.
- Kacsó 1981: C. Kacsó, *Necropola tumulară de la Lăpuș*. Teză de doctorat (manuscris), Cluj-Napoca.
- Kacsó 1987: C. Kacsó, *Beträge zur Kenntnis des Verbreitungsgebietes und der Chronologie der Suciú de Sus-Kultur*, Dacia, 31, p. 51-75.
- Kacsó 1995: C. Kacsó, *Date noi cu privire la prima fază a culturii Suciú de Sus*, Apulum, 32, p. 83-99
- Kacsó 2001: C. Kacsó, *Zur chronologischen und kulturalen Stellung des Hügelgräberfeldes von Lăpuș*, în *Der nordkarpatische Raum in der Bronzezeit*. Symposium Baia Mare 7-10 Oktober 1998 (ed. C. Kacsó), p. 231-278.
- Kacsó 2003: C. Kacsó, *Noi descoperiri Suciú de Sus și Lăpuș în nordul Transilvaniei. (Neue Suciú de Sus und Lăpuș-Funde im Norden Siebenbürgens)*, Marmatia, 7/1, p 105-181.
- Kalicz 1960: N. Kalicz, *A későbronzkori Felsőszőcsi csoport leletei és kronologiai helyzete*. AÉ, 87, p. 3-15.
- Kemenczei 1982: T. Kemenczei, *Die Siedlungsfunde der Gáva-Kultur aus Nagykovács, FA, XXXIII, p. 73-95.*
- Kemenczei 1984: T. Kemenczei, *Die Spätbronzezeit Nordostungarns*, Budapest.
- Kobal' 2000: J. Kobal', *Bronzezeitliche Depotfunde aus Transkarpatien (Ukraine)*, PBF, XX/4. Stuttgart.
- Kobal' 2007: J. Kobal', *До питання про хронологію та періодизацію культури Станове*. Записи наукового товариства імені Шевченка. Праці археологічної комісії, Львів, p. 583-599.
- Kovács 1967: T. Kovács, *Eastern connections of North-Eastern Hungary in the late Bronze Age*. FA, 18, (1966/67), p. 27-58.
- László 1973: A. László, *Considerații asupra ceramicii de tip Gáva din Hallstattul timpuriu*. SCIV, 24/4, p. 575-608.
- László 1994: A. László, *Începuturile epocii fierului la est de Carpați. Culturile Gáva-Holíhrady și Corlăteni-Chișinău pe teritoriul Moldovei. Die Anfänge der Eisenzeit im Ostkarpatenraum. Die Gáva-Holíhrady- und Chișinău-Corlăteni- Kultur auf dem Gebiet der Moldau*, BiblThrac, București.
- Lupu 1989: N. Lupu, *Tilișca. Așezările arheologice de pe Cățanaș*, București.
- Marta 2005: L. Marta, *Der bronzene Nadeldepotfund von Petea, Kr. Satu Mare. [Depozitul de ace din bronz descoperit la Petea, jud. Satu Mare.]*. În: (ed. T. Soroceanu) *Bronzefunde aus Rumänien II. [Descoperiri de bronzuri din România]*, Bistrița – Cluj-Napoca, p. 75–94.
- Marta 2008: L. Marta, *Groapa 154 a așezării din epoca bronzului de la Lazuri. Depunere aflată în legătură cu producerea berii preistorice? (Pit 154 from Bronze Age settlement in Lazuri. Objects deposition related to the making of prehistoric beer?)* Satu Mare StCom, XXIII–XXIV/1, 2006-2007, p. 111–129.
- Matuz–Nováki 2002: D. Matuz – Gy. Nováki, *Spätbronzezeitliche, früheisenzeitliche Erdwälle in Nordungarn*, Budapest, 2002.

- Mozsolics 1960: A. Mozsolics, *Der Tumulus von Nyírkárász – Gyulaháza*, ActaArchHung, 12, p. 113-123.
- Mozsolics 1973: A. Mozsolics, *Bronze-und Goldfunde des Karpatenbeckens. Depotfundhorizonte von Forró und Ópályi*, Budapest.
- Mozsolics 1985: A. Mozsolics, *Bronzefunde aus Ungarn. Depotfundhorizonte von Aranyos, Kurd und Gyemely*, Budapest.
- Németi 1990: I. Németi, *Contribuții la cunoașterea sfârșitului epocii bronzului din nord-vestul României*, SCIVA, 41/1, p. 19-54.
- Németi 1997: I. Németi, *Descoperirile arheologice de la Lazuri-“Lubi-tag” (jud. Satu Mare) din anii 1995-1996. Cercetări arheologice din aria nord-tracă*, 2, București, p. 78–86.
- Németi 1999: J. Németi, *Repertoriul arheologic al zonei Careiului*, București.
- Németi–Molnár 2007: J. Németi – Zs. Molnár, *A tell telepek fejlődése és vége a Nagykároly síkságon és az Ér völgyében*, Cluj-Napoca.
- Ordentlich 1971: I. Ordentlich, *Aria de răspândire a culturii Otomani de pe teritoriul României* [Die Verbreitung der Otomanikultur in Rumänien], Marmăția, II, 1971, p. 19-35.
- Pankau 2004: C. Pankau, *Die älterhallstattzeitliche Keramik aus Mediaș/ Siebenbürgen*, UPA 109, Bonn.
- Patay 1976: P. Patay, *Vorbericht über die Ausgrabungen zu Poroszló-Aponhát*, FA, XXVII, p. 193-201.
- Patek 1974: E. Patek, *Präskytische Gräberfelder in Ostungarn*. Symposium zu Problemen der jüngeren Hallstattzeit in Mitteleuropa, Bratislava, p. 337-362.
- Petrescu-Dîmbovița 1977: M. Petrescu-Dîmbovița, *Depozitele de bronzuri din România*, București.
- Pop 2008: D. Pop, *Câteva considerații privind stadiul cercetării culturii Suciului de Sus și a grupului Lăpuș (Some considerations about the research stage of the Suciului de Sus culture and the Lăpuș group)*, Satu Mare StCom, XXIII/I, 2005, p. 61–92.
- Popovich 2006: I. Popovich, *Zakarpattia za dobe rannyyogo zaliza*, Kraków–Lwów.
- Potušniak 1958: F. M. Potušniak, *Arheologicini znanidki bronzovovo ta zaliznovo viku na Zakarpattii*, Ujgorod.
- Roman–Németi 1990: P. Roman–I. Németi, *Epoca bronzului în nord-vestul României*. SympThrac, 8, Satu Mare–Carei, p. 34-41
- Smirnova 1974: G. I. Smirnova, *Complexele de tip Gáva-Holihrad – o comunitate cultural-istorică*, SCIVA, 25/3, p. 359-380.
- Soroceanu 2008: T. Soroceanu, *Bronzefunde aus Rumäien: die vorskythenzeitlichen Metallgefäße im Gebiet des heutigen Rumäien / Descoperiri de bronzuri din România: vasele de metal prescitice de pe actualul teritoriu al României*. Cluj-Napoca.
- Stapel 1999: A. Stapel, *Bronzezeitliche Deponierungen im Siedlungsbereich Altdorf – Römerfeld und Altheim, Landkreis Landshut*. Tübinger Schriften zur Ur- und Frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie, 3. Waxmann, Münster–NewYork–München–Berlin.
- Stratan–Vulpe 1977: I. Stratan – A. Vulpe, *Der Hügel von Susani*, PZ, 52/1, p. 28-60.
- V. Szabó 1996: V. G. Szabó, *A Csorva csoport és a Gáva kultúra kutatásának problémái néhány Csongrad megyei leletgyűttes alapján. Forschungsprobleme der Csorva-Gruppe und Gáva-Kultur auf grund einiger Fundverbände aus der Komitat Csongrád*, MFMÉ, II, p. 9-109.
- Teržan 2005: B. Teržan, *Metamorphose - eine Vegetationsgottheit in der Spätbronzezeit*. In: B. Horejs, R. Jung, E. Kaiser, B. Teržan (Hrsg.) Interpretationsraum Bronzezeit. Bernhard Hänsel von seinen Schülern gewidmet, UPA, 121, Bonn, p. 241–261
- Vasiliev 1983: V. Vasiliev, *Probleme ale cronologiei Hallstattului în Transilvania*, AMN, 20, p. 33-57.

- Vasiliev 1995: V. Vasiliev, *Fortifications de refuge et établissements fortifiés du premier âge du fer en Transylvanie*, Bucarest.
- Vasiliev 2008: V. Vasiliev, *Bemerkungen zu den bitronkonischen Gefässen, die für die Gáva-Kultur Kennzeichnend sind*, EphNap, XVI-XVII, 2006–2007, p. 7-16.
- Vasiliev–Aldea–Ciugudean 1991: V. Vasiliev–I. A. Aldea–H. Ciugudean, *Civilizația dacică timpurie în aria intracarpatică a României. Contribuții arheologice: Așezarea fortificată de la Teleac*, Cluj-Napoca.
- Vasiliev și colab. 2002: V. Vasiliev – A. Rustoiu – E. A. Balaguri – C. Cosma, *Solotvino - "Cetate" (Ucraina Transcarpatică). Așezările din epoca bronzului, a doua vârstă a fierului și din Evul Mediu. Solotvino „Cetate (Transcarpathian Ukraine). The Settlements of the Bronze Age, the Second Iron Age and the Early Medieval Times*, BiblThrac XXXIII, Cluj-Napoca.
- Vende 1910: A. Vende, *Szatmar vármegye*, Budapest.
- Zatlukál–Zatlukál 1937: J. Zatlukál–E. Zatlukál, *Adatok a Podkarpatszka Rusz praehistoriájához*, Munkácsvo.