

## Table of contents

Preface .....	13
<b>1 The earliest pottery of the Middle Danube basin</b> .....	17
1.1 Introduction .....	17
1.1.1 Defining the Starčevo-Criş-Körös culture .....	18
1.2 Starčevo settlements .....	19
1.2.1 Subsistence economy .....	21
1.2.2 Burials .....	23
1.3 Material culture .....	27
1.3.1 Worked stone .....	27
1.3.2 Osseous artefacts .....	28
1.3.3 Ceramics and relative chronology .....	30
1.4 Radiocarbon dating and Bayesian chronological modelling <i>by John Meadows</i> .....	34
1.4.1 Introduction .....	34
1.4.2 Methods .....	37
1.4.3 Results .....	38
1.4.3.1 Overall chronology .....	38
1.4.3.2 Geographical patterns .....	40
1.4.3.3 Dates of analysed assemblages .....	42
1.4.3.4 Typochronology .....	42
1.5 Summary .....	44
<b>2 Methods and materials</b> .....	47
2.1 Introduction .....	47
2.1.1 Why investigate pottery? .....	48
2.2 Site selection .....	50
2.3 Sampling strategy .....	50
2.4 Provenance and technological analysis .....	52
2.4.1 Scientific analyses .....	53
2.4.1.1 Minero-petrographic analysis in thin section .....	53
2.4.1.2 XRD .....	59
2.4.1.3 SEM-EDX imaging and analysis .....	59
2.5 Reading data with multivariate statistical programmes .....	61
2.6 Technology and social aspects .....	62
<b>3 Romanian Banat sites</b> .....	65
3.1 Dudeştii Vechi point Movila lui Deciov .....	65
3.1.1 Archaeological context .....	65
3.1.2 Geology and soil samples .....	67
3.1.3 Pottery analyses .....	67
3.1.3.1 Thin section analysis .....	67
3.1.3.1.1 The Starčevo-Criş Phase IIB .....	67
3.1.3.1.2 The Starčevo-Criş Phase IIIA–B .....	68
3.1.3.2 Correlations between the ceramic fabrics from SCIIB and IIIA–B .....	74
3.1.3.3 SEM-EDX analysis .....	75
3.1.4 Correlation between typology and fabric .....	78
3.1.5 Discussion and summary .....	79
3.2 Foeni-Gaz .....	80
3.2.1 Archaeological context .....	80
3.2.2 Geology of the area and soil sample .....	81
3.2.3 Pottery analyses .....	86
3.2.3.1 Thin section analysis .....	86
3.2.3.2 SEM-EDX analysis .....	88

3.2.4	Correlation between typology and fabric	88
3.2.5	Discussion and summary	90
3.3	Foeni-Sălaş	90
3.3.1	Archaeological context	90
3.3.2	Geology of the area and soil sample	92
3.3.3	Pottery analysis	93
3.3.3.1	Thin section analysis	93
3.3.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	98
3.3.4	Correlation between typology and fabric	100
3.3.5	Discussion and summary	100
3.4	Fratelia	101
3.4.1	Archaeological context	101
3.4.2	Geology of the area	101
3.4.3	Pottery analysis	109
3.4.3.1	Thin section analysis	109
3.4.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	111
3.4.4	Correlations between typology and fabric	115
3.4.5	Discussion and summary	118
3.5	Giulvăz	119
3.5.1	Archaeological context	119
3.5.2	Geology of the area and soil sample	119
3.5.3	Pottery analysis	119
3.5.3.1	Thin section analysis	119
3.5.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	125
3.5.4	Correlations between fabric and typology	125
3.5.5	Discussion and summary	125
3.6	Paşa	127
3.6.1	Archaeological context	127
3.6.2	Geology of the site and soil samples	128
3.6.3	Pottery analysis	128
3.6.3.1	Thin section analysis	128
3.6.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	133
3.6.4	Correlation between typology and fabric	133
3.6.5	Discussion and summary	135
<b>4</b>	<b>Transylvania</b>	<b>137</b>
4.1	Cerişor-Cauce Cave	137
4.1.1	Archaeological context	137
4.1.2	Geology of the area	138
4.1.3	Pottery analysis	138
4.1.3.1	Thin section analysis	138
4.1.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	143
4.1.4	Correlations between typology and fabric	147
4.1.5	Discussion and summary	147
4.2	Gura Baciului	148
4.2.1	Archaeological context	148
4.2.2	Geology of the area, soil and river sand samples	150
4.2.3	Pottery analysis	151
4.2.3.1	Thin section analysis	151
4.2.3.1.1	Phase SCIB-IC	151
4.2.3.1.2	Phase SCIC-IIA (Pit house 10)	166
4.2.3.1.3	Phase SCIC-IIA (Pit house B9b)	167
4.2.3.1.4	Phase SCIIA (Pit house 23)	168
4.2.3.1.5	Phase SCIIA (Pit 10)	168
4.2.3.1.6	Phase SCIIA-IIB (Pit house 23)	169
4.2.3.1.7	Phase SCIV	170
4.2.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	170

4.2.4	Correlation between typology and fabric	175
4.2.5	Discussion	181
4.2.5.1	Overview of technology through the different phases	181
4.2.5.2	Recurrent petro-fabrics throughout the stratigraphic sequence.	183
4.2.6	Summary	183
4.3	Limba-Bordane	184
4.3.1	Archaeological context	184
4.3.2	Geology of the area and soil sample	185
4.3.3	Pottery analysis.	189
4.3.3.1	Thin section analysis	189
4.3.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	190
4.3.4	Correlation between typology and fabric	193
4.3.5	Discussion and summary	193
4.4	Miercurea Sibiului-Petriș.	195
4.4.1	Archaeological context	195
4.4.2	Geology, soil and sand samples	198
4.4.3	Pottery analysis.	199
4.4.3.1	Thin section analysis	199
4.4.3.1.1	Phase SCI(A?)–B.	199
4.4.3.1.2	Phase SCIC–IIA.	206
4.4.3.1.3	Phase SC IIB.	207
4.4.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	207
4.4.4	Correlation between typology and fabric.	210
4.4.5	Discussion and summary	210
4.5	Ocna Sibiului – ‘Triguri’, Salzbach	214
4.5.1	Archaeological context	214
4.5.2	Geology of the area and soil sample	215
4.5.3	Pottery analysis.	215
4.5.3.1	Thin section analysis	215
4.5.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	223
4.5.4	Correlation between typology and fabric	225
4.5.5	Discussion and summary	225
4.6	Orăștie-Dealul Premilor.	226
4.6.1	Archaeological context	226
4.6.2	Geological background and soil sample.	227
4.6.3	Pottery analysis.	227
4.6.3.1	Thin section analysis	227
4.6.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	232
4.6.4	Correlation between typology and fabric	234
4.6.5	Discussion and summary	236
4.7	Șeușa La-cărarea morii.	236
4.7.1	Archaeological context	236
4.7.2	Geology of the area and soil samples	238
4.7.3	Pottery analysis.	238
4.7.3.1	Thin section analysis	238
4.7.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	244
4.7.4	Correlation between typology and fabric.	245
4.7.5	Discussion and summary	246
<b>5</b>	<b>Serbia and Slavonia</b>	<b>249</b>
5.1	Donja Branjevina	249
5.1.1	Archaeological context	249
5.1.2	Geology and soil sample	251
5.1.3	Pottery analysis.	252
5.1.3.1	Thin section analysis	252
5.1.3.2	SEM-EDX analysis	264
5.1.4	Correlation between typology and fabric.	266

5.1.5 Discussion and summary .....	270
5.2 Golokut-Vizić .....	271
5.2.1 Archaeological context .....	271
5.2.2 Geology.....	272
5.2.3 Pottery analysis.....	272
5.2.3.1 Thin section analysis .....	272
5.2.3.2 SEM-EDX analysis .....	277
5.2.4 Correlation between typology and fabric .....	280
5.2.5 Discussion and summary .....	280
5.3 Mostonga .....	283
5.3.1 Archaeological context .....	283
5.3.2 Geology and soil sample .....	283
5.3.3 Pottery analysis.....	283
5.3.3.1 Thin sections analysis .....	283
5.3.3.2 SEM-EDX analysis .....	287
5.3.4 Correlation between typology and fabric .....	289
5.3.5 Discussion and summary .....	289
5.4 Vinkovci.....	289
5.4.1 Archaeological context .....	289
5.4.2 Geology of the area and soil sample .....	290
5.4.3 Pottery analysis.....	290
5.4.3.1 Thin section analysis .....	290
5.4.3.2 SEM-EDX analysis .....	295
5.4.4 Correlation between typology and fabric.....	295
5.4.5 Discussion and summary .....	295
5.5 Ždralovi.....	297
5.5.1 Archaeological context .....	297
5.5.2 Geology of the area and soil sample .....	298
5.5.3 Pottery analysis.....	298
5.5.3.1 Thin section analysis .....	298
5.5.3.2 SEM-EDX analysis .....	301
5.5.4 Correlation between fabric and typology.....	301
5.5.5 Discussion and summary .....	301
<b>6 Local production, pottery exchange, or transmission of ideas? .....</b>	<b>303</b>
6.1 Sites in Romanian Banat .....	303
6.1.1 Earlier sites in Timișoara county: Fratelia, Foeni-Gaz and Foeni-Sălaș.....	304
6.1.2 Comparison between Parța, Giulvăz and Dudeștii Vechi.....	304
6.1.3 Comparison between Fratelia and Giulvăz .....	307
6.1.4 Comparison between Giulvăz, Foeni-Sălaș and Foeni-Gaz .....	307
6.2 Transylvanian sites .....	308
6.2.1 Comparison between Orăștie and Limba-Bordane.....	309
6.2.2 Comparison between Cauce Cave and Miercurea Sibiului-Petriș .....	310
6.2.3 Comparison between Șeușa La-cărarea morii, Ocna Sibiului and Miercurea Sibiului-Petriș. ....	312
6.2.4 Comparison between Șeușa La-cărarea morii and Limba-Bordane.....	315
6.2.5 Comparison between Miercurea Sibiului-Petriș and Limba-Bordane.....	317
6.2.6 Comparison between Miercurea Sibiului-Petriș and Gura Baciului (phases SCI and II) .....	318
6.3 Sites in Slavonia and Serbia.....	319
6.3.1 Comparison between Donja Branjevina and Mostonga.....	320
6.3.2 Comparison between Vinkovci and Ždralovi.....	321
6.3.3 Comparison between Golokut-Vizić, Ždralovi and Vinkovci .....	322
6.3.4 Comparison between Golokut-Vizić and Giulvăz .....	323
6.3.5 Comparison between the Starčevo-Criș pottery fabrics of Ždralovi and Vinkovci and those from Korenovo culture sites of Malo Korenovo and Tomašica.....	325
6.4 Cult objects.....	327
6.5 Net weights, spindle-whorls, and daub samples .....	330

6.6 Discussion.....	331
6.6.1 Assumptions and methods.....	331
6.6.2 Regional patterns.....	332
6.6.3 Potential imports.....	336
6.7 Summary.....	337
<b>7 Typology and raw materials.....</b>	<b>339</b>
7.1 Romanian Banat sites.....	340
7.1.1 Temper vs clay type.....	340
7.1.2 Temper vs shape.....	340
7.1.3 Temper vs decoration and surface treatment.....	343
7.1.4 Temper vs phase.....	344
7.2 Transylvanian sites.....	345
7.2.1 Temper vs clay type.....	347
7.2.2 Temper vs shape.....	347
7.2.3 Temper vs decoration and surface treatment.....	349
7.2.4 Temper vs phase.....	350
7.3 Serbia and Slavonia.....	350
7.3.1 Temper vs clay type.....	350
7.3.2 Temper vs shape.....	350
7.3.3 Temper vs decoration and surface treatment.....	350
7.4 Discussion.....	353
7.4.1 Temper: geographical patterns.....	353
7.4.2 Grog temper.....	356
7.4.3 Typology and clay type.....	356
7.5 Summary.....	358
<b>8 The Starčevo potters.....</b>	<b>361</b>
8.1 Technical traditions of everyday pottery production.....	361
8.1.1 Raw materials: clays and temper.....	361
8.1.2 Forming techniques.....	364
8.1.3 Firing techniques.....	364
8.1.4 Surface treatment and painted decoration.....	366
8.2 Technological variation.....	370
8.2.1 Technology, clay type and cultural tradition.....	370
8.2.2 Technology, form and function.....	371
8.2.3 Macroscopic observation on the Starčevo-Criş potsherds analysed.....	375
8.3 The <i>chaîne opératoire</i> of cult objects.....	375
8.4 Different ceramic technical strategies: the early Neolithic in Europe.....	378
8.5 Conclusions.....	380
8.5.1 The importance of large-scale projects.....	380
8.5.2 Autarkic and interconnected Starčevo society: the social role of the potters.....	380
8.5.3 Cultural transmission and cultural boundaries: the pattern of learning and the legacy of the Starčevo potters.....	383
<b>Appendix 1: pottery catalogue.....</b>	<b>389</b>
<b>Appendix 2: XRD analyses.....</b>	<b>413</b>
<b>Appendix 3: petrographic catalogue – Romanian Banat sites.....</b>	<b>421</b>
<b>Appendix 4: petrographic catalogue – Transylvanian sites.....</b>	<b>427</b>
<b>Appendix 5: petrographic catalogue – Serbian and Slavonian sites.....</b>	<b>439</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>443</b>