

UNIVERSITY „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” FROM IA I
COLLEGE OF HISTORY
DOCTORAL SCHOOL

**A Civilisation
of the Middle Bronze Age
on the territory of Romania.
The Costi a – Komariv
Cultural Complex
(Abstract)**

Scientific coordinator:
Prof. univ. dr. Nicolae Ursulescu

Candidate:
Ioan Ignat

September 2012

„ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” UNIVERSITY OF IAȘI
VICE-CHANCELLORSHIP

No. _____ from _____ 2012

TO _____

We hereby inform you that on 18.09.2012, 09.00 hours, in H1 hall of „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, mister Ioan Ignat will defend, in public session, the PhD thesis A CIVILIZATION OF THE MIDDLE BRONZE AGE ON THE TERRITORY OF ROMANIA. THE COSTI A-KOMARIV CULTURAL COMPLEX.

The evaluation commission has the following members:

President: Prof. univ. dr. Ion Lucrețiu Bîrliba, „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași

Scientific coordinator: Prof. univ. dr. Nicolae Ursulescu, „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași

Referents: Prof. univ. dr. Attila László, „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași
Conf. univ. dr. Mircea Ignat, „Tefan cel Mare” University of Suceava
C.P. I dr. hab. Valentin Dergacev, Institute of Cultural Heritage of the Academy of Sciences of Moldavia from Chișinău

Summary

Thesis summary / 2

- I. Introductory problems / 5**
 - II. The history and the stage of research of the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex / 7**
 - III. The repertory of findings of Costi a – Komariv type in Romania / 8**
 - IV. Elements of quotidian life in Costi a – Komariv cultural complex in Romania / 9**
 - V. Elements of spiritual life in Costi a – Komariv cultural complex in Romania / 15**
 - VI. Final considerations / 16**
- Selective bibliography / 18**

Thesis summary

- I. Introductory problems / 4**
 - I.1. Importance of the theme / 4
 - I.2. Nomenclature / 5
 - I.3. Methodological issues / 6
 - I.4. Geographic framework / 7
- II. The history and the stage of research concerning the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex / 14**
 - II.1. The history of researches concerning the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex / 14
 - II.1.1. The pioneering period (the end of XIX century – the beginning of XX century) / 16
 - II.1.2. The interwar period / 25
 - II.1.3. The post-war period / 32
 - II.2. The stage of researches concerning the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex / 68
 - II.2.1. The nomenclature of the complex and the division in cultural groups/aspects / 69
 - II.2.2. The origins of the cultural complex / 69
 - II.2.3. Settlements and housing structures / 71
 - II.2.4. Spiritual life / 73
 - II.2.4.a. Elements of funerary rites and rituals / 73

- II.2.4.b. Other aspects of the spiritual life / 74
 - II.2.5. Economical life / 75
 - II.2.6. Cultural relations / 77
 - II.2.7. Elements of chronology and dating / 79
 - II.2.7.a. Internal periodization / 79
 - II.2.7.b. Elements of relative chronology / 80
 - II.2.7.c. Elements of absolute chronology / 81
- III. The repertory of Costi a – Komariv type findings in Romania / 84**
 - III.1. Settlements and cemeteries of Costi a – Komariv type / 84
 - III.2. Isolate findings of Costi a – Komariv type / 195
 - III.3. Costi a – Komariv type materials founded in other contemporary cultural circumstances / 213
- IV. Elements of daily life in Costi a – Komariv cultural complex in Romania / 221**
 - IV.1. Habitat structures / 221**
 - IV.1.1. Settlements / 221
 - IV.1.2. Defensive improvements / 230
 - IV.1.3. Dwellings / 234
 - IV.1.4. Hearths / 239
 - IV.1.5. Domestic pits / 242
 - IV.1.6. Buildings of worship / 243
 - IV.2. Occupations and crafts / 245**
 - IV.2.A. Occupations / 246
 - IV.2.A.1. Cultivation of the plants / 246
 - IV.2.A.2. Livestock / 247
 - IV.2.A.3. Hunting, fishing, gathering / 251
 - IV.2.A.4. Salt exploitation / 258
 - IV.2.B. Crafts / 264
 - IV.2.B.1. Metallurgy / 264
 - IV.2.B.1.a. Copper and bronze axes / 264
 - IV.2.B.1.b. Daggers, swords, spearheads / 274
 - IV.2.B.1.c. Metallic needles / 277
 - IV.2.B.1.d. Ornaments / 279
 - IV.2.B.1.e. Other metal objects / 286
 - IV.2.B.2. Processing of clay / 292
 - IV.2.B.2.a. Costi a culture ceramic categories and types / 292
 - IV.2.B.2.b. Ciomortan cultural aspect ceramic categories and types

- / 299
- IV.2.B.2.c. Komariv culture ceramic categories and types / 305
- IV.2.B.2.d. Lunca cultural aspect ceramic categories and types / 314
- IV.2.B.2.e. Decorative types and ceramic ornamentation techniques of the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex / 327
- IV.2.B.2.f. Other objects made in clay / 384
- IV.2.B.3. Stonework / 390
 - IV.2.B.3.a. Stone axes / 392
 - IV.2.B.3.b. Stone spearheads and arrowheads / 398
 - IV.2.B.3.c. Stone curved or straight knives / 404
 - IV.2.B.3.d. Grinders and rubbers / 406
 - IV.2.B.3.e. Other stone objects / 408
- IV.2.B.4. Bone and horn processing / 411
- IV.2.B.5. Other crafts / 415
- V. Elements of spiritual life in Costi a – Komariv cultural complex in Romania / 422**
 - V.1. Funerary rites and rituals / 422
 - V.1.1. Barrow graves / 426
 - V.1.1.a. Types of tumulus / 426
 - V.1.1.b. Rites and rituals of the barrow graves / 432
 - V.1.2. Flat graves / 443
 - V.1.2.a. The typology of flat graves / 444
 - V.1.2.b. Rites and rituals of the flat graves / 446
 - V.1.3. Funerary finding from P uleni in 2001-2002 / 448
 - V.1.4. Sex, age and human type of the deads / 451
 - V.1.5. Inventory items / 456
 - V.1.6. Considerations concerning the funerary rites and rituals / 466
 - V.1.6.a. Geographical considerations / 466
 - V.1.6.b. Spiritual considerations / 469
 - V.1.6.c. Social considerations / 481
 - V.2. Other rites and rituals / 490
 - V.2.1. The cult of the dead or reburial? / 490
 - V.2.2. Rites and rituals of foundation / 491

	V.2.3. Rites and rituals of leaving the settlement / 492
	V.2.4. Rites and rituals of burying a settlement / 493
	V.2.5. Deposits or depositions? / 495
	V.2.6. Sacrifices / 495
	V.3. Solar cult / 496
VI.	Final considerations / 499
	VI.1. Origins / 499
	VI.2. An approach to the terminology of this cultural complex / 501
	VI.3. Internal periodization / 510
	VI.4. The relations of the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex with other contemporary cultures. Relative chronology elements / 513
	VI.5. Costi a – Komariv cultural traditions in Noua culture / 522
	VI.6. Absolute chronology / 525
	VI.7. Conclusions / 527
	List of figures / 537
	Abbreviations / 545
	Bibliography / 548

I. Introductory problems

The Costi a – Komariv cultural complex belongs, in terms of temporal analysis, to the middle period of the Bronze Age from the Carpathian basin, being spread on a significant geographical area which covered a big part of Moldavia and the south-eastern part of Transylvania (Romania), the north of the Republic of Moldavia, the half western zone of Ukraine, the south-eastern zone of Poland (and little territories of Slovakia and Belarus). In this area, it has been found vestiges not only of the cultures Costi a and Komariv, but also of related cultures: Komariv (with its two branches, Eastern and Western) and Sosnica; that's why this cultural circle or block should be named *Costi a – Komariv - Trzciniec – Sosnica*, to cover all the cultural realities of the period.

The mentioned cultural complex is important because it belongs to some populations who lived in the area since the second half of the third millennium BC, when the indo-European branches are crystallizing, when there are achieved many progresses in metallurgy and it appears important changes in social, religious and economical terms etc., which modified completely human societies. It is partially synchronic with Cretan (Aegean zone), Sintashta (Urals Mountains zone), Monteoru (from the south of Moldavia and Muntenia), Wietenberg (from Transylvania), Tei (from Muntenia), Mnogovalikovaja (from the north-pontic zone) civilisations, having important influences above the cultures of the Bronze Age from carpatho-danubiano-pontic area, implicitly above the mentioned cultural realities.

The accomplishment of such a work is important because of the need of knowing the past of the area occupied by the members of this cultural entity in the

Middle Bronze Age. Even if the theme is vast and it will be needed the cooperation of more specialists to emphasize as closely as it can the way of life specific to the period, we will try, as much as possible, to show off the specific of this cultural complex, having at hand the informative resources offered by the archaeological diggings made till this moment and some studies dedicated to the problems of the Romanian Bronze Age, and not only.

The accomplishment of a monograph of this period was a priority to make known some aspects less visible of the quotidian life of some populations who lived, evolved, took form the ancestors and transmitted further to their descendants some ideas, innovations and elements of technique. We must not forget the personal contributions in different domains, the cultures and cultural aspects of the Bronze Age influencing and stimulating them reciprocal.

In terms of naming this cultural complex, we mention that, during this work, we used, for the Romanian findings, the term of *Costi a - Ciomortan - Komariv - Lunca* cultural complex, briefly *Costi a - Komariv* (the Ciomortan aspect was related to the Costi a cultural manifestations and the Lunca aspect to those of Komariv culture). This cultural complex was related to cultural manifestations more extensive in territorial terms, taking part from the *Costi a - Komariv - Trzciniec - Sosnica* cultural circle, which occupied a big part of the south-eastern Europe (named simplified *Costi a - Komariv - Trzciniec*).

To achieve this paper, we used a bibliography pretty large, including titles of the Romanian prehistoric literature, but also foreign, especially Polish, Ukrainian and Moldavian. Unfortunately, the access to some old papers, which turned into account the researches of XIX and even XX centuries, wasn't possible and we used to quote them according to newest studies which resumed some information.

Very helpful were the participations on some archaeological sites from the north of Moldavia, such as Adâncata – *Ima* and *Sub P dure*, Costâna – *Ima*, where we observed directly the findings belonging to Komariv culture.

For a better consultation, we introduced the pictures in the text and not at the end of the work, in a separate section. The critical apparatus was presented in text also, the footer being kept for additional information and explications.

The paper was divided in a few chapter and subchapters, as I can be seen in the summary, which follows broadly the thesis summary.

As for geographic framework in which this people lived, we discovered that they occupied a big part of Moldavia (especially the surface of Boto ani, Suceava, Ia i, Neam counties and the northern parts of Bac u and Vaslui counties) and the south-east of Transylvania (territories from Covasna and Harghita counties), zones framed geographically in Moldavian Plateau, with his sub units, in Moldavian Sub Carpathians and in the lower zones of the Carpathians in south-east of Transylvania.

The area occupied by the Costi a – Komariv communities was drained by some important rivers, first or second degree affluent of the Danube, such as Siret,

Prut, Olt, Trotu , Bârlad, Jijia etc., the valleys of these waters being used as passage routes in different directions. The zone of hilly plain and plateau put his footprint on the economy of the communities of Middle Bronze Age, influencing the occupation and the way of living.

In this final part, I want to thank to my scientific leader, prof. univ. dr. Nicolae Ursulescu, to the officials of the archaeological sites I participated (conf. univ. dr. Dumitru Boghian, curator dr. Ioan Mare , curator dr. Bogdan Petru Niculic), to the members of the committees form the doctoral school (prof. univ. dr. Atilla László, lect. univ. dr. Neculai Bolohan, lect. univ. dr. Vasile Cotiug), to the other teachers, colleagues and to all that, in a way or another, suggested me ideas, gave me advices, facilitated my access to some studies and materials, some of them unpublished, and leaded and supported my steps to this research direction.

II. The history and the stage of research concerning the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex

The history of research of the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex was divided in three phases.

A first phase, the pioneering period, belongs to the interval comprised between the end of the XIX century and the first world war, being characterised by the researches of some amateurs or of well known archaeologists, but who framed incorrectly the discoveries belonging to this cultural complex because of the stage of the knowledge of the time. Here we must include the researches made by A. Kirkor, I. Kopernicki, G. Ossowski, T. Ziemi cki, Josef Szombathy, Raimund F. Kaindl, Hubert Schmidt etc., which did archaeological diggings in different locations mentioned in the sections that were dedicated to them.

It follows the second phase, comprised between the two world wars, when one has realise bigger researches, earlier in the zone from the north of Romania, later in Moldavia and south-eastern Transylvania, starting with the investigations of Leon Kozłowski, Józef Kostrzewski, Tadeusz Sulimirski etc., which managed to establish major features and named distinct cultural groups of the great archaeological complex. For the Romanian zone, we can talk about small field archaeological researches and borings of which it can be mentioned those of Radu Vulpe, Constantin Matas , Marton Roska in the sites of Costi a, Sili tea, P uleni – Ciomortan etc.

The third phase is represented by the post war period, divided in two sub-phases, the first comprising the temporal interval between the world war II and the end of XX century (at the beginning of this sub-phase, it had been made the first systematic researches of this cultural complex in the eponym sites of Costi a and P uleni – Ciomortan, also being named the two cultures/cultural aspects of the Middle Bronze Age in Romania), the other the period after the years 2000 (when

there are restarted the diggings at Costi a, Poduri etc. and started new investigations at Adâncata, Sili tea, Costâna etc. and there are published increasingly more studies related to this subject).

For all of the phases and the sub-phases, there were mentioned, in chronological order and according with the borders of the states existing at the moment on the area of spreading of the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex, the contributions of Romanian, Polish, Ukrainian and Moldavian archaeologists to the identification, accentuation and presentation of the component elements of the complex.

Regarding **the stage of researches**, for the Middle Bronze Age there is a deficiency of the contextual findings, a precarious stage of systematic, interdisciplinary researches due partially to the paucity of cooperation between the specialists analysing this complex. To reconstruct more exactly the way of life of this cultural ensemble, we need archaeo-zoological, archaeo-botanical data, more radiocarbon datings, metallographic and petrographic analysis made on metallic and stone artefacts, discovered in certain contexts, chemical analysis on ceramics, to create a database which could be applied to the next researches, but they lack or they are not published yet.

The majority of the sites known for this period were reported especially from field researches and it has not been made but small borings in some of them. The results of these investigations were published selectively and summarily and often, even if it is considered that some materials come from a settlement, it could come from a deranged burial.

The majority of the archaeological investigations from Romania were started or restarted around 2000, since when it could be observed an impetus concerning the Romanian prehistorical research for this period.

III. The repertory of Costi a – Komariv type findings in Romania

The repertory of Costi a – Komariv type findings in Romania was structured in three sections, the first containing settlements and cemeteries, the second isolate findings assigned to the complex, and the last section the materials of this complex recorded in the cultural layers of contemporary cultures, especially Monteoru, Wietenberg and Tei.

To achieve this repertory we used the alphabetical principle of the localities where Costi a – Komariv type findings were discovered, and for the localities with more than one site we used the same principle, but according to the toponym of the site. Each report was structured in some sections:

- The specification of the locality where the site was discovered, the SIRUTA code or the RAN code of the site;

- A – the history and the type of investigations;
- B – the toponym, the topographical localisation, the geographic location of the discovery place, the position within the hydrographical basin;
- C – the description of the researched structures and of the main findings, eventually with graphic representations;
- D – the afferent bibliography.

The first section of the repertory includes 113 sites where there were discovered trustworthy vestiges of this cultural complex; 17 of them are funeral discoveries. Some other 25 localities form the repertory of isolate findings which, according to analogies, belong to this cultural entity. The last section refers to the discovery of Costi a – Komariv elements in other cultural circumstances, especially Monteoru, Wietenberg and Tei (11 sites).

IV. Elements of daily life in Costi a – Komariv cultural complex in Romania

The chapter of daily life elements refers to the surprise of habitat structures, occupations and crafts which formed the base of the economy of the Costi a – Komariv societies in the eastern zone of the Carpathians in the Middle Bronze Age.

IV.1. Habitat structures.

As for **the settlements** of this cultural complex in Romania, we can see a big diversity, the members of those communities placing themselves on different relief forms, from the ledges of different type of the rivers to high positions of the hills, in the water zones. Many of the settlements situated on high hills seemed to have a more thick cultural layer and could be power centres. The majority of Costi a – Komariv type sites were positioned on the southern side of the hills to better capture the solar light and heat. We observed, at this moment of the researches, the preference to create settlements a little retired from the course of bigger rivers, most of the settlements being positioned on the shores of second or third degree affluent of the Danube, maybe because of the desire to stay farther by the communities which used the valleys of the big rivers as passage routes.

Regarding the settlements types, one can observe **fortified/strengthened settlements** (from a natural/geographic and anthropogenic view) and **unfortified/opened settlements** (situated on low level relief forms and with no special defence structures), between which there are **semi strengthened/semi opened settlements**, which does not have but natural defence elements (two or three steep sides, eventually some sconces with no archaeological traces). One cannot say if, around one **main/central settlement**, bigger and with defensive structures, there were other small settlements, considered **satellites**, which, in case of danger, could search for refuge in the middle of the first one. One can only say that the presence of

Costi a – Komariv discoveries in many places, on a geographic limited area, can be a sign of those, but we don't exclude the possibility of being traces of different stages of development.

Besides settlements with mixed occupations (a long time, it was accentuated the idea of Bronze Age societies with a pastoral or agro-pastoral economy), the last investigations brought to the fore the problem of existence of some **specialised settlements** (better said of some specialised communities which lived in these settlements) in producing staples and finished products, which took the path of local or distance exchanges. Thereby, the seasonal settlements of Lunca – *Poiana Slatinei*, Cucuie i – *Slatina Veche*, Loeva etc. were specialised in obtaining salt from salted water. In the Republic of Moldavia, one has recognized a metallurgical workshop at Coteala and for the Trzcinec area there are known some workshops of flint processing, such as at Dratów, Opole Lubelskie district. One could assume the existence of some metallurgical workshops for the settlements of Boto ana, Costi a, Ko cianiec, Moszny, where there were discovered some fragments of clay spoons and funnels, considered to have taken part in metallurgical activities.

Some of the Costi a – Komariv settlements were situated on high relief forms, to have a natural defence on two or three sides because of the steep slope. The opened side had, habitually, the ditches doubles by earth mounds, maybe even wooden palisades. Not all the mentioned settlements had **defensive structures**, but there are some. The natural defence offered by the steep slopes was completed and strengthened by these defensive structures, divided in four types: **ditches, earth mounds, palisades and towers**. The sites that had such constructions could be considered power centers (Costi a, Sili tea, P uleni etc.).

The dwellings (surface dwellings and huts) of this complex were made by the techniques and with the materials well known for the prehistoric periods: wooden frames and twig braids on which there was imprinted the clay melted with plant materials (which gave consistence to the clay and prevented the creation of cracks because of the drying); sometimes, it is documented the use of stone (hone) to create a more consistent foundation, but generally the dwellings were erected directly to ground; clay or stone floors or no floors at all (there are no clues of wood floors till now); plant materials roof probably (straw, reed); rectangular, round or oval forms; the presence of internal hearths; some of this structures could be used as storages.

The majority of the dwellings had one single room of rectangular shape, eventually with an antechamber/porch made in perishable materials, with no archaeological traces. We have no information about doors, windows, installations for removing internal hearths smoke, furniture etc. Only in the case of some Komariv dwellings there is information about the presence, inside the structure, of some big earthenware, half buried in the ground (storages/warehouse?).

The surface of this living constructions differed between 20 and 25 m². It can be assumed that inside that space more family members lived (parents and children) and in warn seasons they could have slept outside.

The dwellings had, generally, **internal and external hearths**, some of them arranged on a clay layer, eventually with stone, other directly on ground, being used for cooking or with a cult role, related to the cult of fire or of sun. near some of living constructions there were found **waste pits**.

At this chapter, we should talk also about some **cult constructions**, the best example being the one from Poduri, where there were found big dimensioned stone circles, containing human and animal bones and different artefacts.

Concerning the occupations of Costi a – Komariv communities, those were divided in two categories: occupations in fact, from which it has been obtained consumer goods and crafts which gave other goods, non food.

Many of the occupations discussed in the pages of the thesis were considered, in most of the studies, being secondary economic branches, but we consider that this state of affairs should be regarded generally, because it could exist some communities axed on a secondary economic branch (salt exploitation, ceramic production etc.) or communities with mixed or multiple economy, which could depend on geographic zone, climate, staple sources, season etc. One cannot exclude the existence of limited human groups in each community that professed only some kind of services for the use of entire group.

IV.2.A. Occupations.

For the Romanian area, we have little concrete evidences of **the plant cultivation**, but that doesn't mean that this activity was not professed. There were no discoveries of grown plants or seeds, but we know some tools used in this occupation. Is the case of some imperforate stone axes used as hoes. We could also mention stone curve daggers, sickle insertions etc., used to harvest the plants, or some grinders and rubbers, used to grind the grains.

The sites of this cultural complex are rich in animal bones, but only in some cases there were made osteological analysis to distinguish grown or hunted animal types. **The livestock** was an important economical branch of the Bronze Age societies, including the cultural complex we talk about.

Thereby, we can observe that the animals that had a central place in the economy were *Bos Taurus*, *Sus scrofa domesticus*, *Ovies aries*, *Capra hircus*, *Equus caballus*, *Canis familiaris* etc. We don't have exact percentages for this animal remains to observe if there were communities axed on the growth of certain types of domestic animals.

The occupational palette of the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex communities was completed by some activities less archeologically documented: **hunting, fishing, gathering** etc.

An activity that draws the attention in the last decades is that of salt exploitation. For now, for the analysed cultural complex, we have information about this occupation only for a few sites, talking about seasonal settlements used to obtain salt from salted water (Lunca, Oglinzi, Cucuie i etc.). We don't know any sites of gathering salt from mining activities.

The salt is an important mineral for human and animal alimentation, but also for other domains of activity, being considered as the *white gold*. Most probably, the prehistoric communities performed periodic and seasonal movements to the zone with salted water to supplement its needs, the salt being an excellent exchange mark.

IV.2.B. Crafts.

In the category of crafts we included those occupations to process the staples and to obtain finished objects.

The first discussed craft was the **metallurgy**. We know only few metal artefacts, the mentioned area being less rich in such objects comparing to other zones and prehistoric periods. It has been discovered and included in this cultural complex some axes (with collars of clamping the tail, of Darabani, Monteoru, P durenii types or other of A2 or B1 types), ornaments and tools. The repertory could be enriched if we take in consideration some greenish traces observed on other objects, which could come from vanished ornaments.

The Darabani type axes are specific to the spread area of Costi a – Komariv cultural complex, being encountered in the Monteoru area too. Chronologically, they are placed in the first part of the Middle Bronze Age, somewhere at the end of the third and the beginning of the second millenniums BC.

The other axes from this area are the Monteoru type axes, Borle ti version, considered imports or technological borrowings (local products) from the Monteoru's area to Costi a's. The Borle ti version of Monteoru axes was framed chronologically to the Monteoru Ic2-Ia phases, that means in the first part of the second millennium BC.

We must not forget the P durenii or inca types axes, productions of Wietenberg culture, discovered in the eastern zone of the Carpathians, in Komariv area, attesting exchange relations and contacts between the two cultural areas. Also, very important are type A2 or B1 axes, attesting contacts with the Transylvanian zone.

Related to the metallurgy are some daggers, discovered at Poduri, Costi a and in Ukrainian Komariv zone, showing analogies with artefacts from the north-pontic or central-European zones. The bronze sword of Apa type, Oradea version, from Piatra oimului has analogies on a large geographic zone, being related, especially ideologically, to the Aegean zone.

Very important are the ornaments, representative being the *Noppenringe* rings from Sili tea, Costi a and Piatra oimului, proving contacts and influences from Middle Danube area, in other cultures of the Middle Bronze Age (Periam-Pecica, Nitra, Aunjetitz). Simultaneously, they are important for early dating of the sites of origin, at the end of the Ancient Bronze Age and at the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age.

There are also some other ornaments (bracelets, rings, earrings, necklaces etc., made especially in copper or bronze, rarely in precious metal) and tools (needles, awls, buckles, buttons etc.).

One of the most important occupations in prehistoric periods was the **processing of clay**. Ceramic products, by their paste, forms and decors, had an important role in identifying and delimiting an archaeological culture, sometimes more important than other types of products.

Like for other cultures, according to the clay paste, there were separated ceramic categories: coarse, fine and semi-fine, being theoretically separated also the pottery types for different cultures and aspects of this cultural complex in Romania.

Even if we couldn't realize typological series according to development phases, mainly because of the paucity of the sites completely investigated or published, the Costi a – Komariv pottery types are very diversified, including cups, amphorae, little amphorae, tronconical, bitronconical and globular shaped pots, bowl, tureens, jars, cups, glasses and, of course, tulip shaped pots, specific to the Komariv culture.

Analysing the base pottery forms signalled in the sites of Costi a – Komariv cultural complex in Romania, it can be observed than generally it can be meet approximately the same forms for the composing cultures and cultural aspects.

Of course, there are similarities and differences, dues to many factors, such as: the pots were made by hand, so it can be observed differences of shapes, dimensions, inclination of the walls etc.; each potter could interfere in the mental shape of the pot and to produce deviations (which could become the mark of the potter, a symbol of a group or a zonal mark); outside influences could be more significant in some areas to be adopted inside; some shaped and types could be the mark of different phases of development of the complex etc.

Analysing the ceramic decors from the Romanian and Ukrainian sites, it can be observed that there are almost the same ceramic types in the component cultures and cultural aspects.

Of course there are similarities and differences due to many factors: the pots are made by hand and that could lead to multiple differences concerning the dimensions, wall inclination etc; each potter could interfere in the mental pattern of the pot and produce deviations (which could represent the mark of the potter, the symbol of one group or even a zonal mark); outside influences could be more significant in some areas so as to be adopted; some ceramic shapes and types could be the mark of different development phases etc.

The analysis of the decors of the pottery of Costi a – Komariv cultural complex in Romania proved that ornamental motifs were realized by two principal techniques: the deepening in the soft paste of the pot and the pulling out in relief. To those we should add a third technique, rarely met, that of painting/encrusting with white paint of the incisions, observed on some pots. The technique of decorating by stamping wasn't signalled yet for this complex. In turn, these techniques supposed some secondary procedures.

There by, the technique of deepening consisted in making decorative motifs by **incision** (marking some thin grooves with the help of an object with sharp

head), by **impression** (made by an object with a thicker head, possibly with the end of the finders or with the nails or even with an object with thin head in the case of pencilled, round or short linear impressions) or by **nicking/hollowing** in the soft paste before being burned.

By incision there were made hatched or pencilled triangles, hatched rhombuses, horizontal, vertical or slanting lines, strings of linear oblong, vertical or slanting impressions, zigzag, *Besenstrich*, “fir tree” motifs etc.

By impression/pricking could be made the strings of short impressions, strings of successive impressions, strings of pencilled, round, triangular impressions, alveolar motifs etc.

The nicking/hollowing consisted in making in the soft clay of some dimples, especially on the patterns in relief or on the pots rim.

Concerning the technique of pulling out in relief it can be saw two procedures: the pulling out in relief from the soft clay of some motifs and the appending/soldering of motifs made in new supplementary paste, obtaining especially embossed belts and prominences of different shapes and thicknesses.

The frequency of some decorative types in Costi a – Komariv cultural complex differs from case to case, in many situations some types of decors being met in two or more of the components of the complex and others only in one of those. This fact could be due not only to the particularities of each culture/cultural aspect, to the genetic background or to the outside influences, but also to the selective publication of archaeological material and, in some cases, to the insufficient research of the sites.

Analysing more carefully these facts, we could see that base elements which form the ornamental series of this complex are the same; the potters are the ones who mixed and obtained new complex decorative motifs. The general aspect of some ceramic ornaments seems different, but the types of lines and strings used to create triangles, strips and other motifs are the same. Searching the specific of one culture means not to look for the resemblance to identity of the decorative motifs, but looking for the diversity and the presence of certain specific elements which form these decors. That’s why, analysing the ceramic decorations, it can be stated the resemblances between the cultures that form this complex and we can say they are related, not only by the genetic background, but also by some synchronic common elements.

Unfortunately, as for ceramic shapes, it couldn’t be done a separation of these decors according to development phases of the complex.

Related to clay processing, we can mention other types of objects: animal or human plastic representations, spindle whorls, weights of clay, miniatures of cart wheels, spoons and funnels etc.

An important place in the economy of prehistoric societies is the processing of local or allogeneic rocks of which it has been made multiple artefacts: axes, daggers, spearheads, arrowheads, grinders, rubbers, strikers, sling balls, patterns

for casting, whetstones, mace heads etc. As a proof of this occupation we must take in consideration also the processing of stone used for constructions.

The processing of the rocks, some of them of high hardness, suppose the existence of specialised craftsmen which knew the secrets of this craft, many of the objects having a high complexity and finesse. We do not exclude the possibility that some objects could be made by unspecialised persons.

The inventory of bone and horn is also diversified, being signalled handles (some of them beautifully decorated), arrowheads, awls, pushers, needles, buttons etc.

In the category of crafts we also introduced the processing of wood and leather/fur, spinning and weaving, crocheting, knitting etc., some of these less observable archaeologically.

V. Elements of spiritual life in Costi a – Komariv cultural complex in Romania

The life of prehistoric man wasn't so simple as it appears, the individual being accompanied everywhere and in any domain of his activity by a multitude of faiths and superstitions according to whom he practiced different rites and rituals because it existed, like in other periods, the belief that the deity is everywhere and must not be disturbed, but reconciled.

The funerary rites and rituals are one of the most spectacular and complicated spiritual manifestations of a population and more we get far away from them, more is difficult to establish the steps in their progress and the precise symbolist of the inventory elements discovered near the dead.

Even if many of the archaeological monographs discuss about the funerary rites and rituals, we tried to accentuate also some other types of rites and rituals, the new archaeological investigations surprising new aspects of the spiritual life. However, the best known is the funerary domain, his elements being more easily archaeologically recognized. It is sure that the best represented is the Komariv culture for who there are known many funerary findings in our country and over its boundaries, for the versions Costi a and Ciomortan things being less obvious.

The dead of Costi a – Komariv communities were buried in barrow graves and flat graves, using the incineration or the inhumation. The reasons for choosing between barrow graves and flat graves seem to be, according to the ethnographical studies, of social (sex, statute, and age), cultural and religious nature, the incineration and the burial in barrow graves being the privilege of the more important and richer persons. Inclusively the funerary inventory speaks about these social differences, being graves with richer inventory and others with poorer inventory. As we know till now, it has not been found feminine burials in barrow graves.

Even the dimensions of the barrow graves attest the statute differences. A bigger the barrow means a bigger statute of the defunct. A more consistent inventory signifies also a bigger prestige for the dead.

The assumptions were made also for the orientation of the buried dead on the cardinal axe, positioned habitually more or less crouched. The orientation seems to refer to the direction of the existing place of the settlement or of the ancestors' ground, to the position of the sun or moon into the sky etc. The crouched position seems to refer to the position of sleeping or of the foetus in mom's womb.

A few osteological analysis speak about some medical affections specific to the period and about some accidents treated and cures, denoting the care of neighbours for their companions.

We must not forget the intentional animal burials, especially horses, which attest the role of these animals in the economy of the Bronze Age societies.

Within the elements of spiritual life we could mention also other manifestations, such as: the cult of the dead, rites and rituals of reburial, rites and rituals of burying a settlement, rites and rituals of leaving a settlement, rites and rituals of foundation, sacrifices, deposits etc. These examples talk about the multitude of spiritual/religious manifestations, unfortunately less documented archaeologically.

We must remember the cult of the sun, represented by pottery ornaments and in other types of objects made in bone or horn, by some circular stone constructions and circular ditches in funerary domain, by the round shape of the barrow graves etc.

VI. Final considerations

In the final part of the paper, it has been presented some ideas concerning the origins, terminology, relations, chronology and periodization of this cultural complex in Romania, following that the next investigations confirm, infirm or complete these points of view, knowing that the science is in continuous progress and every attempt is a step forward in finding the truth.

Thereby, concerning **the origins** of the cultural components of the complex, it has been stated that they have their origins in the cultures and cultural groups of the Ancient Bronze Age from the inner and extra Carpathian area, being saw also more distant influences, central-European.

The proposed **terminology** took into account the proposals of the Romanian and foreign archaeological literature. The relations between the composing branches of the complex is due especially to the pottery domain, also to the lithic, metallic and bone equipment. So, we proposed the term of *Costi a – Ciomortan – Komariv – Lunca* cultural complex (shortly *Costi a - Komariv*) for the discoveries from Romanian area. Costi a and Komariv were considered independent cultures observing some differences in pottery domain, ornamentation etc; the aspect Ciomortan was related to Costi a culture, being formed in the contact zone of

Costi a, Monteoru, Tei and Wietenberg cultures; the Lunca aspect seemed to represent some Komariv type population incursions in the area of salted water to obtain salt.

At European level, the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex was related to bigger cultural manifestations of the Komariv – Trzciniec- Sosnica cultural circle with his composing cultures and cultural aspects, proposing the syntagma of *Costi a – Komariv – Trzciniec – Sosnica* cultural circle (shortly *Costi a – Komariv – Trzciniec*), to integrate the Romanian discoveries. The named relationship took in consideration especially the ceramic inventory, the funerary rites and rituals, the origins etc.

At this stage of research it can be proposed a **tripartite division** of the evolution of the Costi a – Komariv cultural complex in Romania, being identified an **initial/early phase (I)** (placed somewhere between 2300/2000 and 2000/1900 BC, synchronic to Monteoru Ic4₃-Ic3, Nitra, classical Mierzanowice, Early and pre-classical Aunjetitz, Jigodin final, Wietenberg A1, Helladic III, Early Minoan, Proto-Trzciniec phase etc.), a **developed/middle phase (II)** (placed between 2000/1900 and 1800 BC, synchronic to Monteoru Ic2-Ia, Wietenberg phase II (A2), Komariv I, Br A2 according to Reinecke, Proto-Trzciniec and Early Trzciniec etc.) and a **final phase (III)** (placed between 1800-1600/1500 BC, synchronic to Monteoru Ila-IIb, Wietenberg III, Tei III, Komariv II, classical Trzciniec etc.). We could see another phase IV, of cohabitation between Costi a – Komariv and Noua elements, somewhere at the end of Middle Bronze Age and the beginning of the Late Bronze Age, about 1600/1500 BC.

The relations of the analysed cultural complex with other cultural entities were very tight, being observed such contacts, especially of products and ideas exchanges, with all the neighbours, Monteoru, Tei, Wietenberg, Mnovalikovaja etc., sometimes with more distant cultural areas, from the Middle Danube zone. These relations were interdependent, the influences passing both ways.

There are archaeologically documented some less peaceful relations, especially for Costi a and P uleni settlements, where the Costi a – Ciomortan communities were forcibly removed by Monteoru Ic2 or Wietenberg A1-A2 communities.

An apart situation has been observed at Sili tea site, where the Costi a and Monteoru communities cohabited within the limits of the same settlement.

The mentioned relations are important for the study of relative chronology of Costi a – Komariv cultural complex, on which it could be made the internal periodization.

Another type of relations refers to the surprise of Middle Bronze Age heritages in the Late Bronze Age, Noua culture. The Romanian archaeological literature is full of situations of presence of Noua vestiges with traditions of Costi a – Komariv type, especially in pottery typology and decors. If a part of the materials considered of Noua I type with Costi a – Komariv traditions was reconsidered and

assigned culturally and chronologically to a layer Costi a –Komariv, there are such findings outside the geographic borders of this cultural complex. We don't dispute the existence of a Noua I phase, but we need, in the case of land investigations to be more specific and to assign correctly the discoveries or to a Costi a – Komariv layer, or to one of Noua I type.

On the elements of relative chronology and on some recent radiocarbon dating, the *Costi a – Ciomortan – Komariv – Lunca* cultural complex was placed chronologically between 2300/2000 and 1600/1500 BC, representing the end of the Early Bronze Age and the Middle Bronze Age.

The work is finished by a section named **List of figures** and by the **Abbreviations** and afferent **Bibliography**.

Selective bibliography

- ALEXIANU Marius, DUMITROAIA Gheorghe, MONAH Dan
1992 *Exploatarea surselor de ap s rat din Moldova; o abordare etnoarheologic*, TD, XIII, p. 159-167.
- ALEXIANU M., WELLER Olivier, BRIGAND Robin
2007 *Izvoarele de ap s rat din Moldova subcarpatic . Cercet ri etnoarheologice*, Casa Editorial Demiurg, Ia i.
- ANDRONIC Mugur
2008 *Istoria Bucovinei. De la începuturi pân în epoca cucerii romane a Daciei*, Editura Istros a Muzeului Br ilei, Suceava.
- ANTONESCU-IOVI Silvia
1980 *Toporul cu gaur de înm nu are transversal descoperit la Poduri, jud. Bac u*, SC, III, p. 53-56.
- ARTEMENKO I. I.
1985 *Srednednepetrovskaja kul'tura*, AUSSR, I, p. 364-375.
1987 *Kul'tury pozdnego bronzovogo veka yuzhnoi polosy lesov evropejskoj chasti SSSR, în Epokha bronzы lesnoi polosy SSSR*, Moskva, p. 106-113.
- BEREZANSKAJA S. Sophia
1957 *Pamjatky periodu serednioji bronzы na Desni ta Sejmi*, Arheologija, XI, p. 85-90;
1967a *Tšinecko-komarovskaya kul'tura na severnoj Ukraine*, SA, 2, p. 132-140.
1967b *Osada kul'tury wschodniotrzcinieckiej nad Dnieprem*, ZOW, vol. XXXIII, p. 207.
1971 *Komariv'ska kul'tura*, AUSSR, Kiiv, p. 354-363.
1972 *Srednij period bronzovogo veka v Severnoj Ukraine*, Kiev.
1982 *Severnaja Ukraina v epohu bronzы*, Kiev.
1985a *Komariv'skaja kul'tura*, AUSSR, I, Kiev, p. 428-437.

- 1985b *Vosto notšineckaja kul'tura*, AUSSR, I, Kiev, p. 437-445.
- 1994 *Kammedorij baiojie i kamneobratvivaiojie proizvodstvo*, în *Remeslo epokhi eneolita-bronzy na Ukraine*, Kiev, p. 8-54.
- 1998 *The dating and causes of the disappearance of the Trzciniac culture in the Ukraine*, Kultura i Historia, Lublin.
- BOGHIAN Dumitru, IGN Tescu Sorin, IGNAT Ioan, VIERU Elena
- 2012 *Costâna, com. Todire ti, jud. Suceava. Punct Ima* , CCA Campania 2011, p. 266-268, pl. 150.
- BOLOHAN Neculai
- 2000 *Cross-cultural Relations within the Balkans during the Middle and Late Bronze Age*, SAA, VII, p. 307-316.
- 2003 *Recent Discoveries belonging to Early/Middle Bronze Age in Central Moldavia*, ArhMold, XXVI, p. 195-206.
- 2010 „All in One”. *Issues of Methodology, Paradigms and Radiocarbon Datings Concerning the Outer Eastern Carpathian Area*, Signa Praehistorica ..., p. 229-244.
- BOLOHAN N., CRE U Cristina
- 2004 *Recent Discoveries belonging to Early/Middle Bronze Age in Central Moldova*, TCW, vol. I, p. 55-76.
- BOLOHAN N., DUMITROAIA Gh., MUNTEANU Elena
- 2002 *Sili tea, com. Români, jud. Neam* , CCA Campania 2001, p. 287-289.
- BOLOHAN N., MUNTEANU Elena Roxana
- 2001 *Sat Sili tea, com. Români, jud. Neam* , în *Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 44-49.
- BOLOHAN N., MUNTEANU EL., DUMITROAIA Gh.
- 2001 *Sili tea, com. Români, jud. Neam* , CCA Campania 2000, p. 229.
- BOLOHAN N. *et alii*
- 2003 *Sili tea, com. Români, jud. Neam* , CCA Campania 2002, p. 292-293.
- 2004 *Sili tea, com. Români, jud. Neam* , CCA Campania 2003, p. 309-311.
- BURT NESCU Florentin
- 2002a *Epoca Timpurie a Bronzului între Carpa i i Prut cu unele contribu ii la problemele perioadei premerg toare Epocii Bronzului în Moldova*, Bibliotheca Thracologica XXXVII, Bucure ti.
- 2002b *Un complex cu schelete de cai din Epoca Bronzului descoperit într-un tumul la Ripiceni (jud. Boto ani)*, Forum Cultural. Buletin informativ, an II, nr. 1, martie, Direc ia jude ean

- pentru cultur , culte i patrimoniu cultural na ional, Boto ani, p. 7-10.
- 2002c *Topoare cu tub transversal pentru fixarea cozii i t i vertical din Moldova (perioada bronzului timpuriu i mijlociu). Încerc ri de ordonare tipocronologic i cultural (), TD, 23, 1-2, p. 171-207.*
- CABALSKA Maria
- 1968 *Quelques remarques sur le rite à incinération en Europe préhistorique, ArchPolona, X, p. 77-101.*
- CAVRUC Valeriu
- 1993 *With Reference to Formation of Noua Culture (a Historiographic Survey), CCDJ, X, p. 83-97.*
- 1996 *Câteva considera ii privind originea culturii Noua, Angustia, 1, p. 67-78.*
- 1999 *Considera ii privind situa ia etnocultural în sud-estul Transilvaniei în Epoca Bronzului Mijlociu, Angustia, 4, p. 13-41.*
- 2000 *Noi cercet ri la P uleni. Raport preliminar. Prezentare general , Angustia, 5, p. 93-102.*
- 2001a *Leg turi între Moldova i sud-estul Transilvaniei în Bronzul Mijlociu, în Cultura Costi a ..., Piatra Neam , p. 55-57.*
- 2001b *Sat P uleni, com. P uleni, jud. Harghita, în Cultura Costi a ..., Piatra Neam , p. 57-71.*
- 2002 *Noi considera ii privind grupul Ciomortan, Angustia, 7, p. 89-98.*
- CAVRUC V., BUZEA Dan Lucian
- 2002 *Noi cercet ri privind Epoca Bronzului în a ezarea P uleni (Ciomortan). Campaniile din anii 2001-2002. Raport preliminar, Angustia, 7, p. 41-88.*
- 2003 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni-Ciuc, jud. Harghita, CCA Campania 2002, p. 314-316.*
- CAVRUC V., BUZEA D., LAZAROVICI Gheorghe
- 2002 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni-Ciuc, jud. Harghita, CCA Campania 2001, p. 306-309.*
- 2004 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni-Ciuc, jud. Harghita, CCA Campania 2003, p. 337-339.*
- 2005 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni-Ciuc, jud. Harghita, CCA Campania 2004, p. 374-375.*
- 2006 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni-Ciuc, jud. Harghita, CCA Campania 2005, p. 355-358.*
- 2007 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni-Ciuc, jud. Harghita, CCA Campania 2006, p. 361-364.*

- 2008 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni-Ciuc, jud. Harghita*, CCA Campania 2007, p. 302-304.
- 2009 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni-Ciuc, jud. Harghita*, CCA Campania 2008, p. 213-215.
- CAVRUC V., CHIRICESCU Andreea (editori)
- 2006 *Sarea, Timpul i Omul*, Editura Angustia, Sfântu Gheorghe.
- CAVRUC V., CIUGUDEAN Horia, HARDING F. Anthony
- 2006 *Vestigiile arheologice privind exploatarea s rii pe teritoriul României în Epoca Bronzului, în Sarea, Timpul, Omul*, p. 41-49.
- CAVRUC V., DUMITROAIA Gh.
- 2000 *Descoperirile apar înând aspectului cultural Ciomortan de la P uleni (campaniile 1999-2000)*, Angustia, 5, p. 131-154.
- 2001a *Cultura Costi a în contextul Epocii Bronzului din România*, Muzeul de Istorie Piatra Neam .
- 2001b *Cuvânt înainte, în Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 7-8.
- CAVRUC V. et alii
- 2000 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni, jud. Harghita*, CCA campania 1999, p. 303-304.
- 2001 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni, jud. Harghita*, CCA Campania 2000, p. 245-247, 345.
- CUCO tefan
- 1978 *Noi descoperiri de topoare de aram i bronz*, SCIV, 29, 4, p. 579-582.
- 1981 *S p turile de la V leni – Piatra Neam (1974-1975)*, MemAnt, VI-VIII (1974-1976), p. 37-56.
- 1992 *Contribu ii la repertoriul arheologic al jude ului Neam*, MemAnt, XVIII, p. 5-61.
- D BROWSKI Jan
- 1972 *Powizania ziem p olskich z terenami wschodnimi w epoche br zu*, Wrocław.
- 1975 *Trzciniec-Komarów-Sosnica (A Culture Cycle from the Early and Middle Bronze Age)*, ArchPol, XVI p. 39-69.
- 2000 *Badania wczesnych faz Epoki Br zu, în Archeologia i prahistoria polska w ostatnim półwieczu*, Pozna , p. 159-166.
- DASC LU Lidia
- 2007 *Bronzul Mijlociu i Târziu în Câmpia Moldovei*, Editura Trinitas, Ia i.
- DASC LU Lidia, BURT NESCU Florentin
- 1997 *Crasnaleuca, jud. Boto ani*, CCA Campania 1996, p. 15.
- DERGACEV Valentin
- 1973 *Pameatniki epokhy bronzy*, AKM, 3, p. 3-58.

- 1986 *Moldavija i sosednie territorii v epokhu bronzy (Analiz i kharakteristika kul'turnykh grupp)*, Kišinev.
- 1994a *Arheologia Republicii Moldova. Retrospectiv istoric*, TD, XV, p. 7-18.
- 1994b *Epoca Bronzului. Perioada timpurie*, TD, XV, nr. 1-2, p. 121-140.
- 1999 *Osobennosti kul'turno-istori eskogo razvitija Karpato-Podnestrov'ja*, Stratum Plus, 2, p. 169-221.
- DERGACIOV Valentin
- 1992 *Zorii istoriei. Orânduirea comunei primitive, în Istoria Moldovei din cele mai vechi timpuri până în Epoca Modernă* (coord. D. M. Gragnev), Editura tiin e a Chi in u, p. 6-26.
- 1994 *Culturi din Epoca Bronzului în Moldova*, Chi in u.
- 2010 *Evolu ia comunit ilor patriarhale. Epoca Bronzului, în DERGACIOV V.A. et alii 2010*, p. 265-312.
- DERGACEV V. A., SAVVA E. N.
- 1985 *Raskopki Komarovskih poselenij u. s. Koteala*, AIM (1981), p. 64-82.
- DERGACIOV V.A. et alii
- 2010 *Istoria Moldovei. Epoca preistoric i antic (pân în sec. V)*, Academia de tiin e a Moldovei, Insitul Patrimoniului Cultural, Centrul Arheologie, Chi in u.
- DIACONU Vasile
- 2007 *Unele date privind Epoca Bronzului pe Valea Ba eului*, Forum cultural, an VII, nr. 4, decembrie, Direc ia jude ean pentru cultur , culte i patrimoniu cultural na ional, Boto ani, p. 4-8.
- 2008 *Recunoa teri arheologice de suprafa pe teritoriul ora ului Târgu Neam*, MemAnt, XXIV, p. 87-118.
- 2009 *Date preliminare despre o nou a ezare a culturii Costi a din jude ul Neam*, Carpica, XXXVIII, p. 43-56.
- 2010a *Un nou sit arheologic din Epoca Bronzului descoperit la olici (com. Petricani, jud. Suceava)*, Suceava, XXXVII, p. 89-98.
- 2010b *Noi situri arheologice în zona de nord-est a jude ului Neam*, MemAnt, XXV-XXVI, p. 417-435.
- DUMITROAIA Gheorghe
- 1987 *La station archéologique de Lunca-Poiana Slatinei, în La civilisation de Cucuteni en contexte européen*, Ia i, p. 253-258.
- 1994 *Depunerile neo-eneolitice de la Lunca i Oglinzi, jud. Neam*, MemAnt, XIX, p. 7-81.
- 2000 *Comunit i preistorice din nord-estul României. De la cultura Cucuteni până în Bronzul Mijlociu*, BMA VII, Piatra Neam .

- 2001a *Considerații asupra culturii Costi a-Komariv de pe teritoriul Moldovei*, în *Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 13-22.
- 2001b *Sat Borleți, com. Borleți, jud. Neam* , în *Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 23-24.
- 2001c *Sat Lunca, com. Vân tori-Neam, jud. Neam* , în *Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 31-40.
- 2001d *Sat Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bac u*, în *Cultura Costi a ...*, p. 42-44.
- 2001e *Sat Prjeni, com. Prjeni, jud. Botoani*, în *Cultura Costi a ...*, p. 44.
- DUMITROAIA Gh., MONAH D.
 1996 *Découvertes du Bronze Moyen dans la station de Poduri-Dealul Ghindaru*, TWCC, p. 287-288.
- DUMITROAIA Gh., MUNTEANU R., PREOTEASA C., GARV N D.
 2009 *Poduri – Dealul Ghindaru. Cercetările arheologice din Caseta C. 2005-2009*, BMA XXII, Piatra Neam .
- DUMITROAIA Gh. et alii
 2003 *Lunca, com. Vân tori-Neam, jud. Neam, punct Poiana Slatinei*, CCA Campania 2002, p. 183-184.
- 2004 *Cucuieni, com. Solon, jud. Bac u. Punct Slatina Veche*, CCA Campania 2003, p. 110-111.
- 2008 *Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bac u. Punct: Dealul Ghindaru*, CCA Campania 2007, p. 230-231.
- 2009 *Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bac u. Punct: Dealul Ghindaru*, CCA Campania 2008, p. 176-177.
- 2012 *Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bac u. Punct: Dealul Ghindaru*, CCA 2011, p. 109-110.
- EL SUSI Georgeta, BURT NESCU Florentin
 2000 *Un complex cu schelete de cai din epoca bronzului descoperit într-un tumul la Ripiceni (județul Botoani)*, TD, XXI, p. 257-263.
- FLORESCU Adrian C.
 1957 *antierul arheologic Trușești*, MCA, 3, p. 203-218.
 1964 *Contribuții la cunoașterea culturii Noua*, ArhMold., II-III, p. 143-216.
 1991 *Repertoriul culturii Noua-Coslogeni din România. Așezările necropole*, CCDJ, IX, C 1 ra i.
- FLORESCU Marilena
 1965 *Quelques problèmes concernant le début de la civilisation de Monteoru de Moldavie (à la lumière des recherches du sud-ouest de la Moldavie)*, Dacia, NS, IX, p. 49-81.

- 1966 *Contribuții la cunoașterea etapelor timpurii ale culturii Monteoru în Moldova*, ArhMold, IV, p. 39-128.
- 1970 *Problèmes de la civilisation de Costi a à la lumière du sondage de Borlești*, Dacia, NS, XIV, p. 51-81.
- 1996 *Quelques données concernant l'organisation territoriale-tribale et la structure économique et sociale spécifique au Bronze Moyen des zones estiques de la Roumanie*, TWCC, p. 493-503.
- FLORESCU M., BUZDUGAN Constantin
- 1962 *Spectrele din așezarea din Epoca Bronzului (cultura Monteoru) de la Bogdanești (r. Tg. Ocna, reg. Bacău)*, MCA, VIII, p. 301-308.
- 1972 *Așezarea din Epoca Bronzului de la Bogdanești (jud. Bacău). Raport amplu asupra cercetărilor arheologice efectuate în anii 1959-1962*, ArhMold, VII, p. 103-205.
- FLORESCU M., C PITANU Viorel
- 1964 *Topoare de aramă și de bronz descoperite la Giceana (raionul Adjud, reg. Bacău)*, ArhMold, II-III, p. 445-451.
- GARDAWSKI Andrej
- 1959 *Plemiona kultury trzcinięckiej w Polsce*, Materiały Starożytności, V, p. 7-189.
- GÓRSKI Jacek
- 1998a *The Foundations of Trzcinięć Culture Taxonomy in Western Poland*, BPS, 6, p. 7-18.
- 1998b *The Question of the Decline of Trzcinięć Culture in Western Małopolska. Trzcinięć Culture vs. Lusatian Culture*, BPS, 6, p. 115-129.
- 2007 *Chronologia kultury Trzcinięckiej na lessach niecki nidskiej*, Biblioteka Muzeum Archeologicznego w Krakowie, tom III, Kraków.
- HAIMOVICI Sergiu
- 2007 *Studiul arheo-zoologic al materialului provenit din habitatul de la Siliștea (c. Români, j. Neam) aparținând culturii Costi a*, CI, SN, XXI-XXIII (2002-2004), p. 81-90.
- IGNACZAK Marcin, MAKAROWICZ Przemysław
- 1998 *The South-Western Borderland of the Trzcinięć Cultural Circle*, BPS, 6, p. 74-86.
- IGNAT Ioan
- 2010 *Cercetări arheologice de teren pe teritoriul satului Stâncă, com. George Enescu, jud. Botoani (I)*, Forum cultural, an X, nr. 1 (36), martie, Direcția Județeană pentru Cultură și Patrimoniul Cultural Național Botoani, p. 9-16.

- IGNAT Mircea
- 1978 *Necropola tumular hallstattian de la Volov – Dealul Burlei*, Suceava, V, p. 107-140.
- 1981 *Contribuții la cunoașterea tereea Epocii Bronzului și a Hallstatt-ului timpuriu în județul Suceava*, TD, II, p. 133-146.
- 2000 *Metalurgia în Epoca Bronzului și Fierului din Podiul Sucevei*, Suceava.
- 2003 *Quelques vestiges de l'Âge du Bronze du nord de la Moldavie*, SAA, IX, p. 155-166.
- 2006 *Necropole tumulare din zona Rădăuți în cadrul lumii tracogetice (sec. VII-V a.Chr.)*, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, Târgoviște.
- IGNAT M., IGNAT TESCUSORIN
- 2002 *Cajvana (c. tun Codru), com. Cajvana, jud. Suceava. Punct Dealul lui Borodea*, CCA Campania 2001, p. 80.
- IGNAT M., NICULIC BOGDAN PETRU
- 2007 *Adâncata, com. Adâncata, jud. Suceava. Punct Sub P. dure*, CCA Campania 2006, p. 31-32.
- IGNAT M., PÎLĂU GH.
- 1982 *Un nou topor de bronz descoperit la Cajvana*, Suceava, IX, p. 493-495.
- IGNAT M., POPOVICI DRAGOMIR N.
- 1980 *Un mormânt în cistă descoperit la Erbneți (comuna Zvoriște, județul Suceava)*, Suceava, VI-VII (1979-1980), p. 657-662.
- IL'INSKAJA V. A.
- 1960 *Poselenie komarovskoj kul'tury u. s. Moșny*, ANUSSR, 10, p. 48-58.
- KADROW SŁAWOMIR
- 1998 *The Central European Dimension of the Decline of the Early Bronze Age Civilization. The Trzcinniec Socio-Cultural System at the Outset of Its Career*, BPS, 6, p. 156-164.
- KAINDL RAIMUND FRIEDRICH
- 1896 *Geschichte der Bukowina, Erster Abschnitt. Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zu den Anfängen des Fürstentums Moldau (1342)*, Czernowitz.
- 1903a *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen der Hügelgräber von Unterhorodnik und Prädit (Bukowina)*, MAGW, XXXIII, p. 82-84.
- 1903b *Prähistorisches aus der Bukowina (Forschungen auf dem Gräberfelde von Unterhorodnik-Prädit und in der prähistorischen Ansiedlung von Szpenitz)*, JZK, p. 98-114.
- KAVRUK Valeri et alii

- 2012 *oimeni (Ciomortan), com. P uleni-Ciuc, jud. Harghita. Punct: Dâmbul Cet ii, CCA campania 2011, p. 139-142.*
- KEMPISTY Andrej
- 1968 *Cmentarzysko ciałopalne kultury trzcinińskiej w Laskach Starych, pow. Węgrów, Wiadomo ci Archeologiczne, vol. XXXIII, p. 234.*
- 1970 *Badania nad staro ytnymi kopcami matopolskimi w latach 1963-1968, SprArch, vol. XXII, p. 75.*
- KIRKOR A.
- 1878 *O grobach kamiennych na Podolu Galicyjskim, ZWAK, II, 1, p. 8-9.*
- KLOCHKO Viktor I.
- 1994 *The weaponry of the Pastoral Societies in the Context of the Weaponry of the Steppe-Forrest Communities: 5000 – 2350 BC, BPS, 2, p. 167-195.*
- 1998 *The Issue of the Eastern Border of the Eastern Trzniec Culture (Loboikivka Metallurgy), BPS, 6, p. 48-73.*
- 1999 *Radiocarbon Chronology of the Early and Middle Bronze Age in the Middle Dnieper Region. The Myronivka Barrows, BPS, 7, p. 163-195.*
- 2001 *Weaponry of Societies of the Northern Pontic Culture Circle: 5000-700 BC, BPS, 10.*
- 2002 *Maces of the Neolithic-Bronze Age of the Northern Pontic Region, BPS, 11, p. 22-30.*
- KLOCHKO V. I., KO KO Aleksander, SZMYT Marzena
- 2003 *A Comparative Chronology of the Prehistory of the Area between the Vistula and Dnieper: 4000-1000 BC, BPS, XII, p. 396-414.*
- KRUŠELNICKA Larisa I.
- 2002 *O nou a ezare din Epoca Bronzului Timpuriu în Ucraina subcarpatic , Angustia, 7, p. 99-114.*
- LÁSZLÓ Attila
- 1993 *Dates radiocarboneet chronologie de la civilisation Noua – Sabatinovka – Coslogeni, CCDJ, X, p. 23-43.*
- 1994a *Ciomortan, EAIVR, vol. I, p. 303.*
- 1994b *Începuturile epocii fierului la est de Carpa i. Culturile Gáva-Holihrady i Corl teni-Chi in u pe teritoriul Moldovei, Bucure ti.*
- 2011 *Unele probleme ale Epocii Bronzului din regiunile est-carpatic. Observa ii pe marginea unei c r i recente, ArhMold, XXXVI, p. 261-269.*
- MARE Ion

- 2010 *Un mormânt în cutie/cist de piatră, din Bronzul Mijlociu, cultura Komariv, descoperit la Suceava - Câmpul an urilor – Strada Parcului, Suceava, XXXVII, p. 45-72.*
- MARE I. *et alii*
- 2002 *Adâncata, com. Adâncata, jud. Suceava. Punct Ima*, CCA Campania 2001, p. 23-27.
- 2003 *Adâncata, com. Adâncata, jud. Suceava. Punct Ima*, CCA Campania 2002, p. 27-30.
- 2004 *Adâncata, com. Adâncata, jud. Suceava. Punct Ima*, CCA Campania 2003, p. 21-24.
- 2005 *Adâncata, com. Adâncata, jud. Suceava. Punct Ima*, CCA Campania 2004, p. 21-24.
- 2006 *Adâncata, com. Adâncata, jud. Suceava. Punct Ima*, CCA Campania 2005, p. 42-44.
- 2008 *Suceava, jud. Suceava. Punct: Câmpul an urilor (Strada Parcului)*, CCA Campania 2007, p. 292-293.
- MATAS Constantin
- 1940 *Cercetări din preistoria judeului Neam*, BCMI, 97 (1938), p. 5-41.
- MONAH Dan
- 1986 *Descoperiri de topoare de aramă în jud. Bacău și Neam*, MemAnt, XII-XIV, p. 31-40.
- MONAH D., ANTONESCU Silvia, BUJOR Alexe
- 1979 *Raport preliminar asupra cercetărilor arheologice din comuna Poduri, jud. Bacău*, MCA, XIV, p. 86-89.
- MONAH D., CUCU T., POPOVICI Dragomir, ANTONESCU Silvia
- 1981 *Săpăturile arheologice din Tell-ul cucutenian Dealul Ghindaru, com. Poduri, jud. Bacău*, CA, V, p. 9-10.
- MONAH D., DUMITROAIA Gh., WELLER O., CHAPMAN J.
- 2007 *L'exploitation du sel à travers le temps*, Centre International de Recherche de la Culture Cucuteni, Piatra Neam, Institut d'Archéologie Iași, Piatra Neam.
- MONAH D. *et alii*
- 1987 *Raport preliminar asupra săpăturilor arheologice de la Poduri-Dealul Ghindaru (1984-1985)*, MemAnt, XV-XVII (1983-1985), p. 9-19.
- 2001 *Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bacău. Punct: Dealul Ghindaru*, CCA Campania 2000, p. 190-198.
- 2002 *Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bacău. Punct: Dealul Ghindaru*, CCA Campania 2001, p. 242-246.
- 2003a *Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bacău. Punct: Dealul Ghindaru*, CCA Campania 2002, p. 243-245.

- 2003b *Poduri – Dealul Ghindaru. O Troie în Subcarpa ii Moldovei*, BMA XIII, Piatra Neam .
- 2004 *Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bac u. Punct: Dealul Ghindaru*, CCA Campania 2003, p. 242-244.
- 2005 *Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bac u. Punct: Dealul Ghindaru*, CCA Campania 2004, p. 281-283.
- 2006 *Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bac u. Punct: Dealul Ghindaru*, CCA Campania 2005, p. 275-277.
- 2007 *Poduri, com. Poduri, jud. Bac u. Punct: Dealul Ghindaru*, CCA Campania 2006, p. 274-275.

MUNTEANU Elena-Roxana

- 2001a *Alte descoperiri*, în *Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 51-54.
- 2001b *Colocviul Carpa ii R s riteni în Epoca Bronzului. Complexul cultural Costi a-Komarov, Piatra-Neam -Miercurea Ciuc, 12-15 septembrie 2001*, MemAnt, XXII, p. 561-562.
- 2001c *Sat Corl teni, com. Corl teni, jud. Boto ani*, în *Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 24.
- 2001d *Sat Cotârgaci, com. Roma, jud. Boto ani*, în *Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 30.
- 2001e *Sat Crasnaleuca, com. Co u ca, jud. Boto ani*, în *Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 30-31.
- 2001f *Sat V leni, com. Bote ti, jud. Neam* , în *Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 49-51.
- 2010 *Începutul bronzului mijlociu în depresiunile marginale ale Carpa ilor Orientali*, BMA XXIV, Piatra Neam .

MUNTEANU R., DUMITROAIA Gh.

- 2005 *Découvertes de l'Âge du Bronze dans les Sous-Carpates de la Moldavie*, în *Scripta praehistorica. Miscellanea in honorem nonagenarii magistri Mircea Petrescu-Dîmbovi a oblata*, Ia i, p. 461-473.
- 2009 *Bronze Age Discoveries at Poduri, Bac u County*, în *In media Res ...*, p. 337-349.
- 2010 *Spada de bronz de la Piatra oimului*, MemAnt, XXV-XXVI, p. 323-328.

NICULIC Bogdan Petru

- 2004 *Noi date cu privire la toporul de la Darabani-Zam esco (Ucraina)*, Suceava, XXIX-XXX (2002-2003), vol. I, p. 411-418.
- 2005 *Considérations sur la période moyenne de l'Âge du Bronze dans le Plateau de Suceava. Le complexe culturel Komarów-Costi a-Biały Potik*, SAA, X-XI (2004-2005), p. 61-68.

- 2007 *Observations concernant le début de l'Âge du Bronze sur le territoire du département de Suceava*, CC, SN, 13, p. 13-47.
- 2009 *Din istoricul preocup rilor arheologice în Bucovina. Societatea Arheologică Română*, Editura Universității Suceava, Suceava.
- 2010 *Les premiers tumuli de la Bucovine. Les recherches de la fin du XIXe siècle et le début du XXe siècle de la zone Horodnic de Jos (dép. de Suceava)*, SAA, XVI, p. 71-92.
- NICULIC B. P., COJOCARU Ilie
- 2006 *Observații privind realizarea unei podobe descoperite în necropola tumulară de la Adâncata-Ima (județul Suceava)*, ArhMold, XXIX, p. 203-207.
- NICULIC B. P., MARE I., BOGHIAN D., IGNEȘTEȘCU S.
- 2004 *Considerații preliminare asupra practicilor funerare din necropola de tip Komariv – Bilyj Potik – Costi a de la Adâncata-Ima* (jud. Suceava), CC, 10, p. 131-143.
- 2005 *Considérations préliminaires sur les pratiques funéraires de la nécropole du type Komariv-Bilyj Potik-Costi a d'Adâncata-Ima* (dép. de Suceava), SAA, X-XI (2004-2005), p.69-86.
- NICULIC B. et alii
- 2002 *Necropola din Epoca Bronzului de la Adâncata – Imă*, ara Fagilor, SN, anul X, nr. 1 (38), ianuarie-martie, p. 11.
- PASSEK Tatiana
- 1959 *Stoianka Komarovskoi Kultury na srednem Dnestro*, KSIIMK, p. 75.
- POPESCU Anca
- 2000 *Ceramica cu decor striat de la Costi a și Deleni*, Angustia, 5, p. 203-208.
- 2005 *A ezarea de Epoca Bronzului de la Costi a (jud. Neam). Monografie arheologică*, SCIVA, 54-56 (2003-2005), p. 313-322.
- 2006 *Beyond Typology: Metal Axes and Their Potential*, Dacia, NS, L, p. 431-450.
- POPESCU Anca-Diana, B. JENARU Radu
- 2004 *Cercetările arheologice de la Costi a, jud. Neam, din anii 2001-2002*, MemAnt, XXIII, p. 277-293.
- 2008a *Mortuary Practices at Costi a (Neam County)*, Dacia, NS, LII, p. 19-32.
- 2008b *Rivalries and Conflicts in the Bronze Age: Two Contemporary Communities in the Same Space*, Dacia, NS, LII, p. 5-17.
- ROGOZI SKA Renata

- 1959 *Cmentarzysko kultury Komarowskiej w Bukównie*, MatArch, I, p. 97-124.
- 1963 *Sprawozdanie z bada stanowisk kultury trzcinieckiej w Guciowie I Bondyrzu, pow. Zamo w 1961 roku*, SprArch, vol. XV, p. 84.
- SAVA Eugen
- 1991 *Rela ii între cultura „Mnogovalikovaia” dintre Nistru i Prut i cultura Monteoru*, TD, XII, 1-2, p. 15-37.
- 1994 *Epoca bronzului – perioada mijlocie i târzie (sec. XVII-XII î. e. n.)*, TD, XV, 1-2, p. 141-156.
- SMIRNOVA Galina I.
- 1972 *Novyie issledovanja poselenia Magala*, AS, 14, Moskva, p. 12-31.
- 1974 *Stojanska komarovskoj kul'tury u s. Nezvisko na Dnestre*, AS, 16, Leningrad, p. 50-61.
- SULIMIRSKI Tadeusz
- 1968 *Corded Ware and Globular Amphorae North-East of the Carpathians*, University of London, The Athlone Press.
- SWIESZNIKÓW Igor K.
- 1965 *K voprosu o shodstee k razlicii t iine koj i komarovskoj kul'tur*, Novoe v sovetskoj arheologii, MIA, 130, Moscova, p. 86.
- 1967 *Kultura Komarówska (Na podstawie materiałów z pñ. Podkarpacia I zach. Wołynia)*, ArchPolski, XII, 1, p. 39-107.
- 1968 *Bogatye pogrebenija komarovskoj kul'tury u. s. Ivania Rovenskoj oblasti*, SA, nr. 2, p. 167.
- 1976 *Problema prlischozdenija komarovskoj kul'tury, în Eneolit i bronzovyy vek Ukrainy*, Kiev, p. 96-116.
- 1985 *Podkarpatskaia kul'tura*, AUSSR, Kiev, p. 375-380.
- SZÉKELY Zoltán
- 1970 *Cultura Ciomortan*, Aluta, I, p. 71-88.
- 1971a *Contributions à la connaissance du développement de la civilisation de Wietenberg*, Dacia, NS, XV, p. 307-317.
- 1971b *Contribu ii la cunoa terea Epocii Bronzului în sud-estul Transilvaniei*, SCIV, 22, 3, p. 387-400.
- SZÉKELY Z., SZÉKELY Zsolt
- 1979 *A ezarea din Epoca Bronzului de la Peteni*, MCA, XIII, p. 71-72.
- SZÉKELY Zsolt Kékedy
- 1992 *Culturile Epocii Bronzului din sud-estul Transilvaniei*, Marisia, XV-XXII (1985-1992), p. 29-32.

- 1997 *Perioada timpurie i începutul celei mijlocii a Epocii Bronzului în sud-estul Transilvaniei*, Bibliotheca Thracologica XXI, Editura Vavila Edinf SRL, Bucure ti.
- SZOMBATHY Joseph
- 1894 *Prähistorische Recognoscierungstour nach der Bukowina im Jahre 1893*, JBLM, 2, p. 11-21.
- 1895 *Zweite Recognoscierungstour in die Bukowina*, JBLM, 3, Cern u i, p. 20-24.
- 1896 *Zweite Recognoscierungstour in die Bukowina*, JBLM, 4, p. 131-135.
- 1899 *Vorgeschichte*, în *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild. Bukowina*, Wien, p. 49-56.
- ADURSCHI Paul
- 1981 *Toporul cu gaur transversal descoperit la Oroftiana de Sus, pe Prut*, Hierasus, IV, p. 7-11.
- URSULESCU N., BATARIUC P. V.
- 1978 *Cercet rile arheologice de la Mihoveni (Suceava) – 1973*, Suceava, V, p. 89-106.
- URSULESCU N., POPOVICI Dragomir
- 1987 *Contribu ii la cunoa terea ritului funerar din Bronzul Mijlociu în nordul Moldovei*, SCIVA, 38, 1, p. 72-76.
- URSULESCU N., ADURSCHI Paul
- 1988 *Mormintele de înhumate, de tip Costi a, descoperite la Pr jeni (jud. Boto ani)*, SCIVA, 39, 1, p. 45-52.
- VULPE Alexandru
- 1961 *K voprosu o periodizacii bronzovogo veka v Moldove*, Dacia NS, V, p. 105-122.
- 1963 *Nackenscheibenäxte aus der Moldau*, Dacia, NS, VII, p. 511-516.
- 1964 *Cu privire la unele topoare de aram i bronz din Moldova*, ArhMold, II-III, p. 127-141.
- 1970 *Die Äxte und Beile in Rumänien*, vol. I, PBF, IX, band 2, München.
- 1973 *Începuturile metalurgiei aramei în spa iul carpato-dun rean*, SCIV, 24, 2, p. 217-237.
- 1975 *Die Äxte und Beile in Rumänien*, vol. II, PBF, IX, band 5, München.
- 1995 *Stand und Aufgaben der Urnenfelderforschung im Karpatenraum*, în *Beiträge zur Urnenfelderzeit Nördlich und Südlich der Alpen Monographien RGZM*, 35, p. 389-397.
- 1996 *Spa iul egeo-anatolian i Europa sud-estic în lumina unei revizuirii a cronologiei Epocii Bronzului*, în *Memoriile Sec iei*

- de tiin e Istorice i Arheogice*, seria IV, tom XXI, Editura Academiei Române, p.33-47.
- 2001a *Epoca metalelor. Perioada mijlocie a Epocii Bronzului*, în *Istoria românilor* (coord. M. Petrescu-Dîmbovi a, Al. Vulpe), vol. I, Bucure ti, p. 254-255.
- 2001b *Perioada mijlocie a Epocii Bronzului la est i vest de Carpa ii R s riteni*, în *Cultura Costi a ...*, Piatra Neam , p. 9-12.
- VULPE Al. *et alii*
- 2002 *Costi a, com. Costi a, jud. Neam* , CCA campania 2001, p. 114.
- 2003 *Costi a, com. Costi a, jud. Neam* , CCA campania 2002, p. 108.
- 2004 *Costi a, com. Costi a, jud. Neam* , CCA campania 2003, p. 104-105.
- 2005 *Costi a, com. Costi a, jud. Neam* , CCA campania 2004, p. 130-131.
- VULPE A., POPESCU A., B JENARU R.
- 2006 *Costi a, com. Costi a, jud. Neam* , CCA campania 2005, p. 140-141.
- 2007 *Costi a, com. Costi a, jud. Neam* , CCA campania 2006, p. 136-137.
- 2008 *Costi a, com. Costi a, jud. Neam* , CCA campania 2007, p. 115-116.
- VULPE A., POPESCU A., B JENARU R., GAVRIL Elena
- 2009 *Costi a, com. Costi a, jud. Neam* , CCA campania 2008, p. 103-104.
- VULPE Al., ZAMO TEANU Mihai
- 1962 *S p turile de la Costi a*, MCA, VIII, p. 309-316.
- VULPE Radu
- 1941 *Les fouilles de Calu*, Dacia, VII-VIII (1937-1940), p. 13-44.
- ZAMO TEANU M.
- 1964 *Depozitul de topoare de bronz de la Borle ti (raionul Buhu i, reg. Bac u)*, ArhMold, II-III, p. 433-440.