

ASOCIAȚIA ROMÂNĂ DE ARHEOLOGIE

STUDII DE PREISTORIE

4/2007

**Editura Renaissance
București
2007**



ASOCIAȚIA ROMÂNĂ DE ARHEOLOGIE

STUDII DE PREISTORIE 4

COLEGIUL DE REDACȚIE

Redactor șef: Silvia Marinescu-Bîlcu

Membri: Douglass W. Bailey, Adrian Bălășescu, Cătălin Bem, Constantin Haită, Marcel Otte, Valentin Radu, Anne Tresset.

Coperta: Greutate din lut aparținând culturii Gumelnița (Căscioarele-*Ostrove*).

Colegiul de redacție nu răspunde de opiniile exprimate de autori.

Manuscrisele, cărțile și revistele pentru schimb, orice corespondență se vor trimite Colegiului de redacție, pe adresa Șos. Pantelimon 352, sc. C, ap. 85, sector 2, București sau prin email:
ara.romania@gmail.com; aroarh@yahoo.com

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României

Marinescu-Bîlcu Silvia

Studii de preistorie nr. 4/ Silvia Marinescu-Bîlcu ,

Douglass W. Bailey, Adrian Bălășescu, Cătălin Bem, Constantin Haită, Marcel Otte, Valentin Radu, Anne Tresset

Bucuresti, Editura Renaissance, 2007

ISBN 978-973-8922-28-0

330(075.8)

Sponsorizări și donații:

ADMINISTRAȚIA PORTULUI CONSTANȚA

S.C. DIGITAL DOMAIN S.R.L.

ISBN 978-973-8922-28-0

SUMAR

Douglass W. BAILEY An interview with Ruth Tringham	7
Roxana DOBRESCU Obsidianul din așezările aurignaciene din nord-vestul României <i>Obsidian in Aurignacian sites from north-west Romania</i>	17
Corneliu BELDIMAN, Diana-Maria SZTANCS Pierres et mammouths. Les ivoires ouverts au Paléolithique supérieur en Roumanie – données récentes	33
Radian-Romus ANDREESCU Valea Teleormanului. Considerații asupra plasticii antropomorfe <i>Telorman Valley. Aspects regarding anthropomorphic figurines</i>	53
Sanda BĂCUEȚ CRÎȘAN Cluj - Cheile Turzii - Lumea Nouă. From general to particular – discoveries in the Șimleu Depression	67
Silvia MARINESCU-BÎLCU "Greutăți" decorate din aria Gumelnița <i>Decorate "clay weights" in Gumelnița culture</i>	87
Alexandru DRAGOMAN, Sorin OANȚĂ-MARGHITU Against functionalism: review of Pietrele archaeological project	105
Cătălin LAZĂR, Valentin PARNIC Date privind unele descoperiri funerare de la Măriuța- <i>La Movilă</i> <i>Data about some funeral discoveries at Măriuța-La Movilă</i>	135
Mihaela GĂTEJ, Andrei SOFICARU, Nicolae MIRIȚOIU Expertiza antropologică a osemintelor umane de la Măriuța- <i>La Movilă</i> (com. Belciugatele, jud Călărași) <i>Anthropological expertise on human bones from Măriuța-La Movilă archaeological site</i>	159
Alexandru S. MORINTZ Neue daten zur prähistorischen Ansiedlung bei Tăușanca (Gemeinde Ulmeni, Bezirk Călărași)	169
Cristian SCHUSTER Erwägungen zu den befestigten bronzezeitlichen Siedlungen an der Unteren Donau (Südrumänien)	179
David PECREAU Archéontologie et Paléontologie. Les Insectes: témoins du passé des hommes et de leur environnement	189

PREZENTĂRI DE CARTE

Ludovic Orlando, *L'anti-Jurassic Park: Faire parler l'ADN fossile*, Aux éditions Berlin-Pour la Science, 2005, ISBN 2-7011-4136-2, 272 pag., 21 fig (Adriana Maria STAN)..... 201

Abrevieri..... 203

Interview with Ruth Tringham

Douglass W. BAILEY*

Ruth Tringham is Professor of Anthropology and Co-director of the Multimedia Authoring Center for Teaching in Anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley.

Douglass Bailey: What are you working on now? I understand that you recently organised an event on Second Life¹ which was based on work at Çatalhöyük?

Ruth Tringham: Second Life is one of a suite of projects that I am involved in at the moment and which all revolve around working with the media archives (e.g., the images, the videos, and the databases) of Çatalhöyük. Work involves thinking about these three types of databases and about how we build narratives out of them. The narratives that we are building for Çatalhöyük are created by re-purposing the data in different ways. The first project that builds narratives out of databases is called the *Remediated Places* project², and the first place that I remediated was Çatalhöyük. Others that are in the works are based on the Presidio of San Francisco and at Fort Ross which is located further north in California. The process (and concept) of remediation is based on the book *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (1999; MIT Press) by Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin. "Remediation" is the process of mediating what has already been mediated through re-purposing or re-forming the media (i.e., through photography or any other mediating media) and is at the heart of New Media. When we mediate something like digital media, or when we write about something or take a photograph of something, our actions and the processes we use are not random nor are they unimportant. As the author of the photograph, you set up the photograph. Furthermore, you can take a photograph (which is already a remediation) and then you can remediate it again and use it in a different context. An example of remediating a place could be when you take a photograph or make a video of walking across Çatalhöyük. A visitor can walk across Çatalhöyük, can take their own photographs, or can look at your video. In fact we could produce the video so that it played things that were different from the things that you actually see when walking across the site. In these senses, remediation is a process of unbalancing, and it is a process of getting you to think about objects and experiences that are different from those things that have been found at a site. The process makes us ask questions. What does this act of walking across this site mean to me? What reactions does it trigger in me or in other people. What are the memories that are triggered when I walk across a site. For example, when someone walks across Çatalhöyük today, they have no way of knowing where the Berkeley team excavated 1997-2003 since it has been filled in.

DB: How do this process and these actions become archaeological?

RT: I am redefining archaeology, the process of archaeology, what we do, and what we think. The question of who we are as authors of the past is as important a question as are questions about the products of our interpretations. The products of our work are the narratives, the stories that we as archaeologists come up with about the past. Making this process as transparent as possible is an important part of archaeology. The discovery of archaeology is not just the past as reconstructed, but it is also about us constructing the past. When I walk across the site, I am thinking of many, many different things which might not be about the past but which might all be about this past place and about walking across it in the present. All of this is archaeology because it has to do with presenting the past and with pasting the past.

* Douglass W. Bailey is Professor in European Prehistory at Cardiff University, Cardiff School of History and Archaeology, Humanities Building, Column Drive, Cardiff CF10 3XU, United Kingdom, baileydw@cardiff.ac.uk, dwbailey@stanford.edu

¹ Second Life is an internet based virtual world (<http://secondlife.com>).

² <http://chimeraspider.wordpress.com/>

DB: Is this an archaeology of the prehistoric or of the recent past?

RT: It is more about the past as relatively recently remembered. There is work within historical archaeology that is exciting for prehistoric archaeologists. Historical archaeology forefronts issues of the different scales of the past. Historical archaeologists are familiar with a richness of narrative that prehistoric archaeologists are not used to. I became interested in the importance of the individual life histories, and this is something that is unusual for prehistoric archaeologists to think about as a legitimate part of their archaeology.

DB: Was this what you were doing at Çatalhöyük, or had you written about this before that. In 1991, you wrote a very important article ("Households with Faces: the challenge of gender in prehistoric architectural remains") for Joan Gero and Meg Conkey's book *Engendering Archaeology* (Blackwell). Was that article part of the emergence of your interest in this issues?

RT: Yes, in the "Households with faces" paper, I created a fictitious radio interview. This was an act of remixing: taking things which I thought these real individuals might have said and mixing them with things that they had said or written, and I put all of these things into new contexts. That article was an early version of remediation. For me, it started with the *Women and Production in Archaeology* conference held in 1988 in South Carolina, which has come to be called the "Wedge Conference". In South Carolina, I had an ah-ha experience, especially talking with Henrietta Moore. It was a big turning point for me, though in reality I slipped into it very easily. I realised that I had wanted to do this sort of writing for many years, but I had thought that it was not a legitimate way of doing archaeology or of writing archaeology. The ah-ha experience came also with the material that I was studying at the time (i.e., burnt houses from the Neolithic of southeastern Europe). I had already been examining this problem but the conference encouraged me to turn the way that I was looking at it around. The traditional way was to present the data in the third person singular and to accept that my analysis was a proven fact (e.g., that the houses had been burnt deliberately and that we should thus ask why they had been burnt). Instead, I began to approach the material in a new way. In this manner, I began thinking that if we believed that the houses were burnt deliberately, then we should try to follow through with that idea to see how it would have affected individual actors. How would the people have felt? This process added a rich dimension to my archaeology, one which I had not had before. For me the whole thing was an explosive idea; I am allowed to write about this, I am allowed to write about this in alternative forms of narrative.

DB: Has the work at Çatalhöyük provided a fertile environment for continuing this type of work both of alternative narratives and on burnt houses?

RT: Çatalhöyük has been different in many ways from my work on the Southeast European burnt houses. Importantly, it presents a different type of architecture. At Çatalhöyük, you can be more certain about the ground-plan and interior of a building because the buildings were made of mud brick. On the other hand, at Çatalhöyük, you don't have the hugely dramatic events of the house burnings. What you do have with the Çatalhöyük houses are the many events in the history of that building, events that you can reconstruct in a way that would never be possible with the houses in Southeastern Europe because of the nature of the evidence. Çatalhöyük allowed me to take the idea of the life history of a house and to look at the changes within the life of a house. This became a focus for the excavation, and we have had the time, the money, and the facilities to do this work. In seven years (1997-2003) we were able to excavate a house in this way and produce a history of that house which we are publishing now. In Southeastern Europe, the events are much more dramatic and are at a different scale of resolution, comprising the house's construction, its occupation, its burning, and then its rebuilding. This is a very different scale of resolution from the scale of phases and sub-phases in a house's history and modification with which we write about the Çatalhöyük houses. So from these points of view (and from the point of view of writing), working at Çatalhöyük has been very different from working in Southeastern Europe. The other thing that we have at Çatalhöyük is the presence of human remains under the houses. In Southeastern Europe, we did not have the remains of individuals and this made it more difficult to write about; it took more imagination. Clearly there had to have been men, women and children of all different ages and one had to use one's imagination to write about that. At Çatalhöyük we have the human remains, though we are not certain how many people were living in the houses at any one time, and certainly it varied from house to house.

DB: Is it important to you to ask and answer questions about how many people were living in a house or at a site at a particular time?

RT: In some ways, no, these questions are not important. On the other hand, you need to consider them in order to consider the life history of the house, the life histories of the people who were living in the house, and the life histories of the things that they were working and living with. From that point of view, you need to think about who was in a particular house, and you need to consider the various possibilities. Maybe you need to think about a nuclear family (as some would define it) or of large agglomerated households. At Çatalhöyük, we have had 18 people excavating and working within the space of one of the houses. Therefore, archaeologists who think that there were no more than 5 or 6 people in a house need to think that there may have been many more. To think about the number of people in a house, you need to play constructively with the idea rather than aim to find the definitive answer. It is interesting to think about the people's engagement with that space, about what house is being occupied at any given time and whether other houses nearby were being occupied at the same time. It is interesting to think about how large a village was. Many people think that Çatalhöyük was a single large village or town, that it was one settlement, an organic whole with everyone working together. I think that it is much more likely that there were three or more small villages creating a single archaeological mound; thus it is interesting to begin to think away from the individual house and into the neighbourhood.

DB: Your work on burnt houses in Southeastern Europe is one of your most widely felt contributions to prehistoric archaeology. How did that research develop?

RT: It started when I was digging Selevac. The idea that was conventionally understood was that when sites like Selevac burned down, it was a huge, site-wide conflagration that burned all of the houses together, and that the burning could have been caused by an invasion of people who were linked with the Kurgans. There was also the argument that the fires could have been accidental. It wasn't my opinion that all of these conventional ideas were wrong. It was in the mid-1970s and archaeology was caught up with arguments over Processualism. I had just been writing an article about experimentation and the need for middle range research (empirical hypothesis testing). My thoughts were that, in order to link any ideas of accidental burning to the evidence of burnt houses, we needed to have empirical hypotheses that could be tested. If the houses were burnt accidentally, how could you prove it? My gut feeling was that you could not just declare that all of the houses were burnt. You had to have some sort of research strategy that determined whether they were all burnt accidentally, whether they were all burnt deliberately at the same time, or whether they were burnt deliberately in separate fires. At the same time as I was thinking about these things, Mirjana Stevanovic was becoming very interested in archaeological architecture, and specifically house construction clays that she needed for her Masters research. So, together we dreamed up a strategy of how we would test the ideas about house burning. At Selevac, the team had been asking similar questions about other materials like ground stone, flint, and bone tools. I thought that this use-life approach which we were applying to the site's other analytical categories of material could be applied to architectural material. Michael Schiffer and Randy McGuire had written an article at this time asking similar questions.³ So, we were faced with the task of demonstrating the conditions of the conflagration of these Neolithic houses. It became a question: can we prove that these were individual fires? We could not prove it at Selevac because we did not have the horizontal exposure that we needed; the excavation was a series of small trenches. Then we started working at Gomolava and there we expanded the strategy and started looking at how we would get the empirical evidence to study the burning of the houses. Mira went off to Wageningen, Holland to study with Professor Leenert van der Plas and started do X-ray Diffraction and X-ray Florescence analysis of clays and burning temperatures, while I was designing a new excavation at Opovo which I planned specifically to test these ideas. I knew what I wanted to do at Opovo because of the burnt houses. As this was happening I was reading about houses, especially the Wilke and Rathje article⁴ and then I realised that I could bring this work into the research as well as ideas about separate households. This was

³ McGuire, R., and Schiffer, M. 1983. A theory of architectural design. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 2: 277-303.

⁴ Wilk, R. and Rathje, W. 1982. Household archaeology. *American Behavioral Scientist* 25: 617-39.

exciting because it might provide a context in which to understand why people might have wanted to burn their households.⁵

DB: Was your Doctoral research on similar topics?

RT: My PhD was very much culture-history. I was an exchange student in Prague for a year (1963-4) and I worked with Bohumil Soudsky. I had already spent some time there the previous year when I was an undergraduate student enrolled at Edinburgh University. Stuart Piggott, my professor at Edinburgh, suggested that I write to Jirf Neustupny and he put me in touch with Soudsky who had a large project at Bylany. I spent a summer there working for him. As an undergraduate, I had already worked in Denmark and in Norway. I was very ambitious to travel. For the first year of my PhD I got a British Council scholarship to go to Prague. I spent the year in Czechoslovakia, either in Prague or down at Bylany. I was interested in the Linear Pottery Culture and Soudsky suggested that I should do something that the travel restrictions of the period prevented him and others in the region from doing. He suggested that I should travel, talk to people, and do doctoral research about the link between the Neolithic of southeastern Europe and of central Europe. And that work became my PhD and ended up as the book, *Hunters, Fishers and Farmers of Eastern Europe, 6000-3000 BC* (1971: Hutchinson) which I produced while I had my first teaching job working at University College London. Peter Ucko was a Lecturer there teaching the history of material culture. This was something that Darryll Forde had started with a book called *Habitat, Society and Economy* (1934; London) in which he argued that you had to understand the ethnographic use of things, about how people used materials, about how they were incorporated in society, and about how only then could you look at them in the past. That was my first introduction into anthropology. I was literally one step ahead of the students I was teaching. I had never done any anthropology. I loved it. Finally, I could see how these things from the past might have been used. It made me think how boring archaeology was because we had so few remains. And I thought, maybe, I should become an ethnoarchaeologist. And I would have become one, but Harvard came looking for a Europeanist, a "straight" archaeologist. And that's how my brain got drained. I stayed at Harvard from 1971-8.

DB: What were the differences between being at University College London and being at Harvard?

RT: Harvard was very exciting. At the start, I went to go to Harvard almost out of interest only, thinking at least I will get a free trip to America. When I got there, the people in the department seduced me with their enthusiasm. There was Karl Lamberg-Karlovski, Hallam Movius (though he was not so enthusiastic), Steve Williams, Irv Devore, Jerry Sabloff (who had just been hired), and Michael Mosley. Everyone was very excited about what you were doing. In Britain, it was never very cool to say that you were interested in what someone else was doing. Another difference was that there was money for research, big money for research. The British sources of money were very scarce at that time. And I think that it is still the case, though it has changed somewhat with EU money. So at Harvard there was money, and there was also a large non-academic staff; the whole organisation of the department was much bigger. They had professional people, lots of them, and they had graduate student instructors to help with the teaching. These were things that I knew did not exist in Britain. It was quite amazing. The salaries were huge compared to what I had been getting in London. Also, there was a very vibrant community of archaeologists across America. I went to the meetings of the Society of American Archaeology and it was very exciting. It was the time when the New Archaeology was just emerging and I became very involved in that. People were interested in my lithic micro-wear analysis which I had been doing during post-doctoral research; I continued that research throughout my time at Harvard. In fact, I was hired by the University of California at Berkeley to do that sort of work, though it was at that point, in reality, that I changed over to studying the contact traces of architecture. So, the work on fire and burnt houses started when I came to Berkeley.

DB: What were the differences you encountered when you left Harvard (a major private university) and came to Berkeley, an equally excellent school but a public one within the large University of California system?

⁵ Stevanovic, M. 1997. The Age of Clay: the social dynamics of house destruction. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 16:334-95.

RT: The biggest difference for me is that Berkeley had a feeling of non-hierarchy in the department. At Harvard, you had a huge mass of tenured professors and then there were the little Assistant and Associate (untenured) Professors (I was one). They were always promising that I would get tenure, but it would always depend on some particular funding source. Everyone told me that they would never hire for tenure from inside the department, but I still naively believed I had a chance. This was very different from Berkeley where it was assumed that you would have tenure if you continued doing and publishing your research. Also Berkeley had a Civil Service system with promotional steps up which you could proceed. So every three years you would go through a promotion process. You would probably not be refused promotion if you continued to produce. It was a positive thing with a lot of people in the middle rank (like me at the time) who were producing and being happy about doing their work. At Harvard, people would run around worried about getting tenure and about their ambition and their desire for tenure. At Harvard, once you got tenure, then that was it. You became a grand professor and no-one would ever do any checks and balances on you, but nor could you increase your salary regularly. That system can be abused very easily and you could do a minimum of teaching. At Berkeley, it didn't matter if you were tenured. Tenure became much less of an issue; the issue became, are you pulling your weight. Every three years you have to show that you are doing your teaching load, that you have been doing your research productively, that you have been doing your service to the university. This assessment is public. In this system, it is also possible that people don't do anything and then they don't have to participate in this system and thus don't go up the steps. So, you can opt out, and in theory no-one will know that you have opted out, but in reality everyone does know. You are working in a group where you are much more likely to be censured if you do not pull your weight.

DB: How do departments grow and change or move in particular directions? How has the Berkeley department developed since you arrived?

RT: When I arrived, there was a big strong group of people in the Early Hominid group, particularly Glyn Isaac and Desmond Clarke. These were the people who wanted me to be part of them, although I was no longer working on stone tools. Palaeoanthropologists Tim White, Clarke Howell, and Sherry Washburn were also part of this group. There was also archaeologists Jim Deetz, John Graham and John Rowe. They were all men and it was quite intimidating to be the only woman amongst them. Today the department is very, very different. During the 1980s we had problems agreeing on whom to hire as new archaeologists. It became crucial because in the late 1980s/early 1990s, the university went through some difficult financial times and they offered senior people early retirement; John Graham and Jim Deetz both took early retirement. In addition, Glyn Isaac had left to go to Harvard. So the archaeologists were down in numbers by several people. The Early Hominid group wanted to hire a stone tool person after I had decided that I was not going to do stone tools any more. They wanted someone to do African topics and I wanted to hire someone with a more interesting theoretical background, rather than stone tools and experiments on stone tools. Finally I made an alliance with the Social Anthropologists and we hired Meg Conkey against the wishes of the Early Hominid group; even though she researched Palaeolithic Europe, they did not regard her as a real archaeologist because she didn't currently direct an excavation. Some of us argued that archaeology was not about having your own site. Meg had worked in the field and was beginning a survey programme and with this we pushed through the appointment. In the same year, we hired Kent Lightfoot. Meg, Kent and I made an alliance and we moved archaeology into a separate building so that the archaeologists would have a place where we could be together. We hired Pat Kirch and then Christine Hastorf and then Rosemary Joyce and by then we were very strong. We all worked together. And now I was enjoying my life in the department. Before that I hadn't enjoyed it. I had been fighting to get things done, to develop new curricula, and there was always another group of people saying, we don't want to do that. I just didn't feel very strong or confident at that time and so I spent a lot of time in Southeastern Europe in the early 1980s.

One of the things that was important in the 1990s in the growth of the department was being able to create, thanks to Meg Conkey, the Multimedia Authoring Center for Teaching in Anthropology (MACTiA). And I received a three year award, a Presidential Chair in Undergraduate Education which allowed me time off to develop some of the multimedia work. That was incredibly important support from the university and made a big difference to my subsequent research and teaching.

DB: What is the most important thing that an institution can do for an archaeologist?

RT: Time. Freeing up time to allow people to annotate their images and to complete those pieces of work in a project that only the archaeologist can do. Time for people to do the work that it is not possible to get someone else to do.

DB: What is a proper archaeologist? You mentioned that you had to fight in some of the appointments that you wanted made at Berkeley because some colleagues did not consider some of the applicants to be proper archaeologists.

RT: The classic view of an archaeologist is somebody who excavates and this is the view that archaeology equals excavation. This remains in the popular definition of archaeology. But a field programme of archaeology can be different from an excavation. It doesn't have to be excavation. It can be one of heritage management. It can be one of non-destructive survey, of GIS. I think that this has broadened the definition of "proper" archaeological work has been changing. Meg Conkey was doing some very interesting interpretive work, and what she was writing was based on empirical data that she had collected. The boundary used to be between the field archaeologist and the armchair archaeologists and the armchair archaeologists would travel around and look at things (museums, archives). I don't think that you can really say what is archaeology and what isn't. I would say that, if I were hiring an archaeologist, I don't mind if they don't have a field project or an excavation. I am interested in whether or not they are doing research in a way that is asking interesting questions with a methodology that is appropriate to a set of data. Also, are they committed to this data? Have they done enough in depth work in this area? Or are they a field butterfly? Those are my conditions for the type of archaeologist that I would hire.

DB: Are there boundaries to what is archaeological research? Is your remediation work archaeological?

RT: Archaeology is being the mediator of the past in some way or another. To continue with the database narrative and remediation projects that I was talking about earlier, in addition to the project on Second Life, there are two other programs that I am working on. These are approaching the same target that I started with in my Chimera Web project in which I have been trying to create an outface for the primary research database. My main aim in these projects is to make my primary research data interesting and engaging to the public or for other archaeologists. If I can't do this, then the data will die. The Chimera Web was about burnt houses and it is something that I am still finishing. It is a very engaging project with lots of stories. I also am working on something called *Dead Women Do Tell Tales* where I join (and contrast) the Opovo material with Çatalhöyük and in which you will be able to search both databases. I have been involved in another project that the Data Services people at Berkeley had been working on (with the support of a federal grant) to do some pilot projects in which they take faculty research (and their primary research data) and make them accessible, useable, and engaging for the public. Since I had been already working with the Data Services people on the Chimera Web, we started work on a project called *Remixing Çatalhöyük*⁶ it is a website which is an outface where the public can come in and learn about Çatalhöyük. It has three or four themed collections of data of images and videos. There is one collection called the *Senses of Place*, another called *The Life History of People, Places and Things* (that also has a teaching module for 12-year olds), another one called *The Public Place of Archaeology*, and one called *Archaeology of Multiple Scales*. These are also the chapter headings in the Berkeley Archaeologists at Çatalhöyük publication that is currently being prepared. For each collection, we have selected 50 items from our main research data base (e.g., an image of one of our skeletons is an item in the *Life History* collection). I wrote the captions for each of the items and each caption is like a mini-narrative about each picture; the captions talk about the context of the picture, about why did we take the picture, and about why it might be meaningful for the public. You can download these things, and there are instructions for people who want to use the items in the collections for their own slideshows. All the media are licensed under a Creative Commons license which allows a user to use them in his/her own work as long as they attribute the item to its authors.⁷ There are instructions for school teachers and

⁶ <http://okapi.dreamhosters.com/remixing/mainpage.html>

⁷ <http://creativecommons.org/license/>

there is a mini-essay that accompanies each theme. There is a remixed video as well. People visiting these collections can then remix the data and upload it back into the project. This is online now. The project has just won First Prize in the American Schools of Oriental Research Open Archaeology Competition.

Many of the things that we are doing in *Remixing Çatalhöyük* are included in our exhibit in Second Life.⁸ In the exhibit we have a model of the East Mound of Çatalhöyük; it is modelled on the contours of the site. We have the South Area (Mellaart's old area) and we have reconstructed structures. You can walk through it and inside the room, and you can see some of the collections. There is also a model of the Berkeley excavation area. In addition we have video-walks and people can walk up the hill watching the mediated video while in Second Life. And there is a facility which you can use to build your own Çatalhöyük and you can upload your work. Again, it is this idea about getting other people interested in your research data.

DB: What are the things that you have published that you wish more people would have absorbed?

RT: I like my "Engendered places in prehistory" article; that is probably my favourite article that I have written. And it has been reprinted a couple of times, so people are reading that. The one that people do not read, but that I wish that they had and wish that they would is "Experimentation, ethnoarchaeology and the leapfrogs in archaeological methodology", written in 1978 in a book edited by Richard Gould, *Explorations in Experimental Archaeology*. Another thing that people don't read, but that I wish they would is the concluding chapter in the Selevac excavation report. There I presented things that I used in my research all through the 1990s and which I am still using. The Selevac project pushed three important models: the intensification of production; sedentism; and households as the unit of social reproduction.

DB: If you were stranded on a desert island, what books would you take? And what luxury would you take?

RT: I would take my computer and a broad-band connection. I would want my computer with a video card and all of my work on it, and thus I would need some electricity. I would take Eric Wolf's *Europe and the People Without History*. I like Braudel, so I would take that. I would take something by John Berger, *Once in Europa*.

Select publications and web resources:

- | | |
|--|---|
| in preparation (edited with M. Stevanovic) | <i>The Last House on the Hill: Excavation of Building 3 at Çatalhöyük, Turkey</i> . Los Angeles, CA.: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology. |
| in press (edited with B. Brukner) | <i>Opovo: the Construction of a Prehistoric Place in Europe</i> . Monograph and CD-ROM to be published by Archaeological Research Facility, UC Berkeley. |
| 2007 (with R. Joyce) | Feminist Adventures in Hypertext. <i>Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory</i> 14: 328-58. |
| 2005 | Weaving house life and death into places: a blueprint for a hypermedia narrative. In <i>(un)settling the Neolithic</i> . Edited by D. Bailey, A. Whittle, and V. Cummings, pp. 98-111. Oxford: Oxbow Books. |
| 2003 | Flaked Stone. In <i>Prehistoric Sitagroi, Excavations in Northeast Greece 1968 1970. Volume 2: the Final Report</i> . Edited by E. Elster and C. Renfrew, pp. 81-126. Los Angeles, CA.: Cotsen Institute. |

⁸ <http://okapi.wordpress.com/2007/11/06/remixing-catalhoyuk-day/>

- 2003 Re-Digging the Site at the end of the twentieth century: large scale archaeological fieldwork in a new millennium. In *Theory and Practice in Mediterranean Archaeology*, edited by J. Papadopoulos and R. Leventhal, pp. 89-108. Los Angeles, CA: Cotsen Institute.
- 2000 (with M. Stevanovic) Different Excavation Styles create Different Windows into Çatalhöyük. In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology: the Example at Çatalhöyük by Members of the Çatalhöyük Teams*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 111-18. Cambridge: McDonald Institute.
- 2000 (with A. Wolle) Multiple Çatalhöyüks on the World Wide Web. In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology: the Example at Çatalhöyük by Members of the Çatalhöyük Teams*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 207-18. Cambridge: McDonald Institute.
- 2000 Southeastern Europe in the transition to agriculture in Europe: bridge, buffer or mosaic. In *The Transition to Agriculture in Prehistoric Europe*, edited by D. Price, pp. 19-56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1998 (with D. Bailey) Expanding the dimensions of early agricultural tells: archaeological research at Podgoritsa, Bulgaria. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 25(4): 373-96.
- 1998 (with M. Conkey) Rethinking Figurines: a critical analysis of Archaeology, Feminism and Popular Culture. In *Ancient Goddesses: The Myths and the Evidence*, edited by C. Morris and C. Goodison. London: British Museum Press.
- 1996 (with M. Conkey) Cultivating thinking/challenging authority: experiments in Feminist pedagogy. In *Gendered Ways of Knowing*, edited by R. P. Wright, p. 224-50. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 1995 Archaeological houses, households, housework and the home. In *The Home: Words, Interpretations, Meanings, and Environments*, edited by D. Benjamin and D. Stea, pp. 79-107. Avebury: Avebury Press.
- 1995 (with M. Conkey) Archaeology and the Goddess: exploring the contours of Feminist archaeology. In *Feminisms in the Academy: Rethinking the Disciplines*, edited by A. Stewart and D. Stanton, pp. 199-47. Ann Arbor, MI.: University of Michigan Press.
- 1994 Engendered Places in Prehistory. *Gender, Place, and Culture* 1(2): 169-203.
- 1992 (with B. Brukner) Excavations at Opovo 1985-87: socio-economic change in the Balkan Neolithic. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 19(3): 351-86.
- 1991 Households with faces: the challenge of gender in prehistoric architectural remains. In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, edited by J. Gero and M. Conkey, pp. 93-131. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- 1991 Men and Women in Prehistoric Architecture. *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review* 3(1): 9-28.
- 1990 (edited with D. Krstic) *Selevac: a Neolithic Village in Yugoslavia*. (Monumenta Archaeologica No. 15). Los Angeles, CA: Institute of Archaeology Press.
- 1990 Conclusion: Selevac in the wider context of European prehistory. In *Selevac: a Neolithic village in Yugoslavia*. (Monumenta Archaeologica No. 15), edited by R. Tringham and D. Krstic, pp. 567-616. Los Angeles, CA.: Institute of Archaeology.
- 1988 (with B. Voytek) Rethinking the Mesolithic: the case of South-east Europe, In *The Mesolithic in Europe*, edited by C. Bonsall, pp. 492-99. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

- 1988 Analysis of the chipped stone industry at Divostin. In *The Neolithic Village of Divostin*, edited by D. Srejovic and A. McPherron, pp. 203-24. Pittsburg, PA.: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- 1985 (with B. Brukner and B. Voytek) The Opovo Project: a study of socio-economic change in the Balkan Neolithic. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 12(4): 425-44.
- 1978 Experimentation, ethnoarchaeology and the leapfrogs in archaeological methodology. In *Explorations in Ethnoarchaeology*, pp. 169-99. Albuquerque, NM.: University of New Mexico Press.
- 1974 (with G. Cooper, G. Odell, B. Voytek and A. Whitman) Experimentation in the formation of edge damage: a new approach to Lithic Analysis. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 1(1): 186-96.
- 1972 (edited with P. Ucko and G. Dimbleby) *Man, Settlement and Urbanism*. London: Duckworth.
- 1971 *Hunters, Fishers, and Farmers of Eastern Europe, 6000-3000 b.c.* London: Hutchinson.
- Real Audiences and Virtual Excavations (RAVE) at Çatalhöyük*
<http://www.mactia.berkeley.edu/features/rave/default.html>
- Open Knowledge and the Public Interest (OKAPI)*, <http://okapi.wordpress.com/>
- Remediated Places Project*, <http://chimeraspider.wordpress.com/>
- Remixing Catalhöyük*, <http://okapi.dreamhosters.com/remixing/mainpage.html>
- Media Literacy in Archaeology Courses*
http://www.mactia.berkeley.edu/courses/Anthro136ij/html/136ij_default.htm
- Okapi Island in Second Life: a mirror of Çatalhöyük, <http://slurl.com/secondlife/Okapi/128/128/0>.

Abrevieri

ACMIT	Anuarul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice, Secția pentru Transilvania, Cluj-Napoca
AIGR	Anuarul Institutului Geologic al României, București
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology, Boston
AJPA	American Journal of Physical Anthropology, New York
Aluta.	Aluta, Sfântul Gheorghe
AMM	Acta Musei Meridionalis, Vaslui
AMN	Acta Musei Napocensis, Cluj-Napoca
AMP	Acta Musei Porolissensis, Zalău
AMT	Acta Musei Tutovenss , Muzeul "Vasile Pârvan" Bârlad
AnB	Analele Banatului S.N., Timișoara
AO (SN)	Arhivele Olteniei, Serie Nouă, Craiova
ARCIFE	Academia RSR, Centrul de Istorie Filologie și Etnografie, Seria Antropologică, Craiova
Argessis	Argessis, Studii și comunicări, Pitești
Apulum	Apulum, Alba Iulia
ArchB	Archaeologia Bulgarica, Sofia
ARCS	Annals of The Royal College of Surgeons, Londra
ArhMold	Arheologia Moldovei, Iași-București
ArheologijaSofia	Arheologija. Organ na Arheologičeskija Institut i Muzej, Sofia
ARMSI	Academia Română. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice, Seria III, București
AS (IMP)	Archaeological Series (International Monographs in Prehistory)
B(M)SAP	Bulletin et Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris, Paris
BA	Biblical Archaeologist, Atlanta
BAI	Bibliotheca Archaeologica Iassensis, Iași
BAR	British Archaeological Reports, Oxford
BAR (BS)	British Archaeological Reports, British Series, Oxford
BAR (IS)	British Archaeological Reports, International Series, Oxford
BF	Before Farming, United Kingdom
BFSC	Buletinul Facultății de Științe, Cernăuți
BibIThr	Bibliotheca Thracologica, București
BMA	Bibliotheca Musei Apulensis, Alba Iulia
BMG	Bibliotheca Musei Giurgiuvensis, Giurgiu
BMN	Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis, Cluj-Napoca
BMJTA	Buletinul Muzeului Județean "Teohari Antonescu", Giurgiu
BMSAP	Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris, Paris
BRGK	Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Frankfurt am Main
BSA	Annual of the British School of Archaeology at Athens, Atena
BSPF	Bulletin de la Société Préhistorique Française, Paris
BSSC	Buletinul Societății Științifice din Cluj, Cluj-Napoca
CA	Cercetări Arheologice, București
CAANT	Cercetări Arheologice în Aria Nord-Tracă, București
CCDJ	Cultură și Civilizație la Dunărea de Jos, Călărași
CI	Cercetări Istorice, Iași
CIAAP	Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques, Bruxelles
Cronica	Cronica Cercetărilor Arheologice, București
Dacia (NS)	Dacia (Nouvelle Serie). Revue d'Archéologie et d'Histoire Ancienne, București
DocPraeh	Documenta Praehistorica, Ljubljana
Drobeta	Drobeta, Drobeta Turnu-Severin
EJA	Journal of European Archaeology, London

ERAUL	Etudes et Recherches Archéologiques de l'Université de Liège, Liège
Eurasia	Eurasia Antiqua, Berlin
IJO	International Journal of Osteoarchaeology, Wiley Interscience.
IJNA	International Journal of Nautical Archaeology, London
INA	Institute of Nautical Archaeology, Drawer
Izvestija	Izvestija na Arheologiskija Institut, Varna
IzvestijaVarna	Izvestija na Narodnija Muzej (Izvestija na Varnenskoto Arheologičesko Družestvo), Varna
JAS	Journal of Archaeological Science
JEA	Journal of European Archaeology, London
JFS	Journal of Forensic Sciences, West Conshohocken
JMA	Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology, London
JWM	Journal of Wildlife Management, Texas
Materiale	Materiale și Cercetări Arheologice, București
MAU	Materiali z Antropologij Ukraini, Kiev
MCA (SN)	Materiale și Cercetări de Arheologie (Serie Nouă), București
MemAnt	Memoria Antiquitatis, Piatra Neamț
MM	Mesolithic Miscellany, Wisconsin
MNIT	Muzeul Național de Istorie a Transilvaniei
OJA	Oxford Journal of Archaeology, Oxford
PA	Probleme de Antropologie, București
PRIA	Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Irlanda
PTRS	Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Londra
PZ	Prähistorische Zeitschrift, Leipzig-Berlin
RDAC	Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus, Lefkosia
SCA	Studii și Cercetări de Antropologie, București
SCIV(A)	Studii și Cercetări de Istorie Veche (și Arheologie), București
SE	Sovetskaja Etnografija, Moscova
SP	Studii de Preistorie, București
StudPraeh	Studia Praehistorica, Sofia
Tor	Tor. Tidskrift för arkeologi – Journal of Archaeology, Uppsala
VAH	Varia Archaeologica Hungarica, Budapesta



ASOCIAȚIA ROMÂNĂ DE ARHEOLOGIE

STUDII DE PREISTORIE **Publicație a Asociației Române de Arheologie** **A publication of Romanian Association of Archaeology**

Dedicată studiilor de arheologie preistorică și celor interdisciplinare, revista publică articole de specialitate, iar suplimentul acesteia – monografiile, acte ale congreselor sau alte contribuții științifice.

Dedicated to prehistoric archaeology and interdisciplinary studies in archaeology, it publishes research articles and includes a supplement for the publication of monographs and other focused contributions.

Adresa ARA:

Address of ARA:

Șos. Pantelimon 352, sc. C, ap. 85, sect. 2, București, 021662, România,
phone: (+40) 0721712378 Cătălin Lazăr; (+40) 0724453872 Adrian Bălășescu,
contact: ara.romania@gmail.com; aroarh@yahoo.com; www.arheologie.ro

Au apărut din aceeași serie:

The following numbers have already been published:

Studii de Preistorie 1/2002

Roxana DOBRESCU - Atelierul aurignacian din punctul Coasta Bușagului (Bușag, comuna Tăuții Măgherauș, jud. Maramureș) / *L'atelier aurignacien du site Coasta Bușagului. (Bușag, comm. de Tăuții Măgherauș, dép. de Maramureș)*

Radian ANDREESCU, Douglass BAILEY, Steve MILLS, Steven TRICK, Pavel MIREA - Locuirea neo-eneolitică din valea Teleormanului, zona Lăceni-Măgura (Southern Romanian Archaeological Project) / *Neo-eneolithic occupation in the Teleorman valley, Lăceni-Măgura floodplain (Southern Romanian Archaeological Project)*

Constantin HAITĂ - Studiu sedimentologic preliminar asupra locuirii neo-eneolitice din valea Teleormanului, zona Lăceni – Vitănești. Southern Romanian Archaeological Project, campania 2000 / *Preliminary results of the sedimentological study of the neo-eneolithic occupation in the Teleorman valley, Lăceni – Vitănești floodplain. Southern Romanian Archaeological Project, 2000 field season*

Adrian BĂLĂȘESCU - Studiu arheozoologic preliminar al faunei de mamifere descoperite pe valea Teleormanului / *Preliminary arheozoological study of the mammal fauna of Teleorman valley*

Valentin RADU - Studiu arheozoologic preliminar al materialului prelevat din siturile de pe valea Teleormanului (Bivalvia, Gastropoda și Reptilia) / *Preliminary arheozoological study of the fauna of Teleorman valley (Bivalvia, Gastropoda and Reptilia)*

Adrian BĂLĂȘESCU, Valentin RADU - Culesul, pescuitul și vânătoria în cultura Boian pe teritoriul României / *La cueillette, la pêche et la chasse dans la culture Boian sur le territoire de la Roumanie*

Silvia MARINESCU-BÎLCU - Noi dovezi ale tradițiilor precucuteniene în mediul cultural cucutenian / *Nouvelles preuves des traditions précucuteniennes dans le milieu culturel cucutenien*

Stănică PANDREA - Observații referitoare la plăcuțele rombice din lut descoperite în așezări Gumelnița din nord-estul Munteniei și sudul Moldovei / *Observations concernant les plaques rhombiques en argile découvertes en établissements Gumelnița du nord-est de la Muntenie et du sud de la Moldavie*

Cristian MICU, Michel MAILLE - Recherches archéologiques dans le cadre de l'établissement-*tell* de Luncavița (dép. de Tulcea)

Cătălin BEM, Traian POPA, Valentin PARNIC, Carmen BEM, Daniel GARVĂN, Dan BĂRBULESCU, Irina GĂLUȘCĂ - Cercetări arheologice pe valea Neajlovului. Considerații generale asupra microzonei Bucșani / *Recherches archéologiques sur la vallée de Neajlov. Considérations généraux sur la microzone de Bucșani*

Constantin HAITĂ - Preliminary considerations on a sedimentary sondage performed on the Eneolithic *tell* from Bucșani

Cătălin BEM - A special Type of Aeneolithic Dwelling. *Unicum* or Deficiency of Conservation?

Valentin PARNIC, Vasile OPREA, Gabi DOBRE - Contribuții la repertoriul arheologic al județului Călărași. Descoperiri gumelnițene pe valea Mostiștei / *Contributions au répertoire archéologiques du département de Călărași. Découvertes gumelnitiennes du vallée de Mostiștea*

Recenzii / Book reviews

Marin CARCIUMARU, *Evoluția omului în cuaternar. Partea a III-a: Tehnologie și tipologie preistorică*, Târgoviște, 2000 (Roxana DOBRESCU)

Marin CARCIUMARU, *Peștera Cioarei Boroșteni. Paleomediul, cronologia și activitățile umane în Paleolitic*, Târgoviște, 2000 (Adrian DOBOȘ)

Studii de Preistorie 2/2003-2004

Douglass W. BAILEY - An Interview with Ian Hodder

Adina BORONEANȚ - The *Tardenoisian* in Romania – a false problem?

Nicolae MIRIȚOIU, Nicușor SULTANA, Andrei SOFICARU - Asupra unui craniu preistoric dintr-o descoperire întâmplătoare de la Schela Cladovei (jud. Mehedinți) / *About a prehistoric skull from a random discovery of Schela cladovei (Mehedinți County)*

Pavel MIREA - Considerații asupra locuirii Dudești din sud-vestul Munteniei / *Considerations about Dudești settlements in S-V Muntenia*

Valeriu SÎRBU, Stănică PANDREA - Neolithic objects bearing incised signs on the bottom found in the carpatho-balkan area -analysis and possible significance

Adrian BĂLĂȘESCU, Mircea UDRESCU - Matériaux ostéologiques du site énéolithique (niveau Boian, phase Vidra) de Vlădiceasca -Valea Argovei, dép. Călărași

Felicia MONAH, Dan MONAH - Les données archéobotaniques du *tell* chalcolithique de Poduri *Dealul Ghindaru*

Silvia MARINESCU-BÎLCU, Radian-Romus ANDREESCU - Piscul Cornișorului. 1945-1946

Alexandru Mihail Florian TOMESCU - Selective pollen destruction in archeological sediments at Grădiștea Coslogeni (Călărași county, Romania)

Tzvetana POPOVA - L'analyse anthracologique et carpologique du site de Madretz (Nova Zagora, Bulgarie)

Cristian SCHUSTER - Zu den *Ochsenhautbarren* (?) in Rumänien

Cătălin DOBRINESCU - Noi puncte de vedere privind cronologia bronzului târziu și a începutului epocii fierului în Dobrogea / *Nouvelles points de vue concernant la chronologie de l'époque du Bronze tardif et le debut de l'Epoque du Fer en Dobroudja*

Cristian LASCU, Silvia MARINESCU-BÎLCU - Noi date privind "depuneri" rituale în peșteri din Mehedinți / *Nouvelles données concernant le « dépôts » rituels dans le grottes de Mehedinți*

Adrian DOBOȘ, Mihaela IACOB, Dorel PARASCHIV - Descoperiri paleolitice în nordul Dobrogei / *Découverts paléolithiques dans le Nord de la Dobroudja*

George TROHANI - Obiecte getice din fier descoperite la Căscioarele *Ostrovel/Objets gétiques en fer découverts à Căscioarele Ostrovel*

Recenzii / Book reviews

Linda ELLIS (editor), *Archaeological Method and Theory: An Encyclopaedia*, 2000, (Cătălin NICOLAE)

Stefan Karol KOZŁOWSKI, *Nemrik. An Aceramic Village In Northern Iraq*, 2002, (Irina NICOLAE)

Frédéric GÉRARD and Laurens THISSEN (editors), *The Neolithic of Central Anatolia. Internal Developments and External Relations during the 9th-6th Millennia CAL. BC*, 2002, (Alexandru DRAGOMAN)

Neța IERCOȘAN, *Cultura Tiszapolgár pe teritoriul României*, 2002, (Cătălin NICOLAE)

În slujba arheologiei / Serving the archaeology

Adrian DOBOȘ - C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor și arheologia paleoliticului/C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor and Paleolithic archaeology

Studii de Preistorie 3/2005-2006

Douglass W. BAILEY - An interview with Michael Shanks

Corneliu BELDIMAN, Diana-Maria SZTANCS - Pendeloques paléolithiques et épipaléolithiques de Roumanie

Adina BORONEANȚ, Alexandru DINU - The Romanian Mesolithic and the transition to farming. A case study: the Iron Gates

Alexandru DINU, David MEIGGS, Adrian BĂLĂȘESCU, Adina BORONEANȚ, Andrei SOFICARU, Nicolae MIRIȚOIU - On Men and Pigs: Were Pigs Domesticated at Mesolithic Iron Gates of the Danube?

Sanda BĂCUEȚ CRIȘAN - The Starčevo-Criș settlement from Zăuan „Dâmbul Cimitirului”. Old and new viewpoints

Sergiu HAIMOVICI - The study of the archaeozoological remains found in pit no 3, containing human skulls from Cârcea - *Viaduct*, Starčevo-Criș culture

Alexandru DRAGOMAN - Texte, discursuri și ideologie în cercetarea (e)neoliticului din România / *Texts, discourses and ideology in (E)Neolithic research in Romania*

Valentina VOINEA, George NEAGU - Începutul eneoliticului în Dobrogea: între prejudecăți și certitudini / *The beginning of the Eneolithic in Dobrogea: between preconceptions and certainties*

Cristian MICU, Florian MIHAIL, Michel MAILLE - Une représentation de bâtiment découverte dans le tell de Luncavița, point *Cetățuia*

Hortensia DUMITRESCU (cu o adnotare de / with an annotation of Silvia MARINESCU-BÎLCU) Zâmbreasca 1947

Mădălin - Cornel VĂLEANU - Descoperirile de la Cucuteni și Societatea de Medici și Naturaliști din Iași (1884-1891) / *Les découverts du site Cucuteni et la Société des Médecins et Naturalistes du Iassy (1884-1891)*

Gabriel VASILE - Un schelet incomplet atribuit primei epoci a fierului (Hallstatt), descoperit la Capidava / *La Bursuci - studiu anthropologic / An incomplete skeleton assigned to first period of Iron Age (Hallstatt), discovered at Capidava La Bursuci - anthropological study*

Matthieu LE BAILLY, Françoise BOUCHET - La Paléoparasitologie. Les parasites comme marqueurs de la vie des populations anciennes

Supplementum 1/2005

Valentin RADU - Atlas for the identification of bony fish bones from archaeological sites, Editura Contrast, București.

Supplementum 2/2007

Corneliu BELDIMAN – Industria materiilor dure animale in preistoria României. Resurse naturale, comunități umane și tehnologie din paleoliticul superior până în neoliticul timpuriu / *L'industrie des matières dures animales dans la préhistoire de la Roumanie. Ressources naturelles, communautés humaines et technologie dès le Paléolithique supérieur au Néolithique ancien*, Editura Pro Universitaria, București.