VINČA–BELO BRDO: VERNISSAGES OF ENEOLITHIC BELGRADE AND ITS VICINITY I

Abstract. – The following paper will discuss the problems of Eneolithic settlements of Baden and Kostolac culture at Vinča near Belgrade. Eneolithic horizons from Vinča site were scarcely published owing to the fact that both Baden and Kostolac layers are not well stratified because of heavy medieval devastations. In spite of all post-depositional destructions Eneolithic settlements at Vinča show enormous significance for understanding the life of the period, both on the micro and macro-regional scale. At the same time, this work is a sort of an insight into the results of ongoing analysis of material culture and socio-economic patterns of Eneolithic period settlements in Belgrade and its vicinity.
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Vinča–Belo Brdo is situated on the right bank of the river Danube, in the immediate vicinity of Serbian’s capital Belgrade. Its importance is recognized as the eponymous site of the Late Neolithic Vinča culture. The abundance of Neolithic architectural remains, ceramic vessels, anthropomorphic figurines, chipped and ground stone, and bone tools has drawn attention shortly after the first excavations in early 20th century conducted by Serbian archaeologist Milojče Vasić. Owing to the thickness of the cultural layers with more than 10 meters of archeological deposits, Vinča became the key site for studying Balkan Neolithic and cross-cultural relations in whole Europe.

Although the finds from Eneolithic and Bronze Age settlements have been neglected for long time, sporadic reports of so called non Vinča or Pannonian ceramic were published by M. Vasić and V. Milojčić, the first scholar who has attributed Eneolithic pottery to Baden and Kostolac cultural layers at Vinča. In the meantime typological and stylistic characteristics of Eneolithic and Bronze Age pottery from Vasić’s excavations at Vinča were briefly evaluated by D. Srejović and B. Jovanović. V.G. Childe also referred to post-Vinčan settlements between 4.5 m and 2.5 m of vertical section, and correctly dated them to his Danubian IV–V cultures, that is to Baden culture and Middle Bronze age period.

In the course of new excavations at Vinča (1978–1986; 1998–2008) numerous Eneolithic finds were associated with small Bodrogkeresztor necropolis, Baden and Kostolac settlements, of which only Bodrekeresztor necropolis has been published adequately. The full scientific analysis of Baden and Kostolac cultural horizons is still
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missing except the proliferation of study on Baden anthropomorphic figurines, and partially published Kostolac ceramic finds. In the following chapters the author will present his analysis of Baden and Kostolac settlements from Vinča–Belo Brdo.

THE BADEN CULTURE SETTLEMENT ORGANIZATION

After the abandonment of the site by the bearers of Late Vinča D2 culture and the reuse of the Vinča in middle Eneolithic elapsed a significant time period, the so called hiatus, which according to relative chronology, could last around two or three centuries. The first reuse of the site was in connection with small Bodrogkerszetur necropolis which consisted of four flat graves dug in to abandoned Vinca settlement. Shortly afterwards, new population occupied Vinča, the bearers of Baden culture, who formed a completely new type of settlement with dug-out houses, open-air hearths and refuse pits (Fig. 1).

Dug-out features were of circular or ellipsoid shape whose size varied from 1,00 m to 2,50 m in diameter, and up to 0,90 m in depth. As a result of implemented field methodology during the 1978–1984 excavations seasons, which considered removing of unified artificial layers, up to depth of one spade (cca. 30 cm), some of the dug out pits were very shallow, with evidenced depths ranging from 0,15 m to 0,40 m. Regarding the function of 17 excavated dug-out structures there is not much to say since almost all of them were heavily devastated with intrusions of Middle Bronze Age settlement and medieval necropolis. The most numerous part of material culture repertoire from dug-out features are sherds of ceramic vessels. Almost all of the excavated Baden culture objects also contained animal bones and river shells, while in just few pits there are documented worked animal bones and/or chipped or ground stone tools, levels of ashes and small daub fragments. The fact that in not a single Baden culture dug-out structure, intact and in situ artifact assemblages have not been found shouldn’t be regarded as an evidence for functional determination of all such structures as refuse pits. Rather, such situation should be sought as an implication of mentioned devastations, and as distinct life biography of each structure which could be functionally used as a house, storage, refuse or ritual pit in different time sequence of the site occupation. However, due to the lack of informations about exact size of the excavated structures and knowledge about (post)depositional processes it is impossible to give a solid interpretation of any dug-out object’s life biography.

As it is obvious from the ground plan of Baden settlement (Fig. 1), the dug-out objects themselves were not grouped in any organized manner, except in the case of irregular cluster of seven pits excavated in the northwestern part of the trench II. Still, the connection between the objects in the mentioned cluster isn’t interpretable since the function of each locus itself isn’t clear. The dug out objects contained neither the floor debris nor the remains of postholes which could suggest the residential purpose of the pits. However, it should be stressed that objects 18 and 19 contained fragments of burnt house daub, the evidence which could be indicative for functional interpretation of a structure as a dwelling on every single layered site. But in case of Vinča, one cannot claim with certainty that the daub in features represents the remains of Baden culture architectural activity, or it was simply thrown in a pit as garbage from the Vinča horizon, after leveling and cleaning of the site by Baden inhabitants. Also, none of the excavated structure was dug-out in the course of acquisition of water or clay, because their lowest levels didn’t reach the clayish subsoil of Vinča settlement. Deductively, it could be concluded that Baden culture dug-out object from Vinča served either for residential, storage, garbage, ritual utility or their function changed during their life time.

Although N. Tasić mentions above ground structures and houses of Baden culture, except one open-air hearth, there isn’t solid confirmation for such claim in field documentation. Also, further difficulty with defining and dating above ground features is the fact that Baden culture horizon is severely devastated with activities of later occupants of the site, during the Eneolithic, Middle Bronze age and Medieval period. Therefore, in many cases when above ground structure is only partially preserved and when there isn’t any diagnostic material, which is in a clear context with the excavated structure, one can not safely date it neither to Eneolithic nor to Middle Bronze age Vatin culture. Only one above ground Baden culture structure has been documented in the course of 1978–1984 excavations. That is an open-air hearth with burnt floor founded with pottery sherd. The exact appearance of the hearth couldn’t be reconstructed since it was only the burnt floor and its foundation that were preserved. The hearth hadn’t had calotte

11 Tacuh 1984, 69.
and its function was probably in the sphere of everyday activities in the settlement such as cooking, and/or maintaining the light and warmth, and scaring the beasts. It looks as the hearth isn’t in any obvious context with some other above ground or dug out Baden feature but due to the fact that in the immediate vicinity of it is the foundation of the biggest dug out feature of the Baden settlement, it shouldn’t be excluded that those structures could be an integral contextual unit.

**STRATIGRAPHY**

Relative-chronological relationship between Eneolithic settlements at Vinča isn’t interpretable on the base of depositional stratification itself. Since, six Baden pits were dug into the floors of late Vinča houses, there isn’t a question about the chronological relationship between those two horizons. On the other hand, a misleading path for determining the relationship between Baden culture settlement and Bodrogkerversztur necropolis was the stratigraphic analysis of correlation between the absolute sea-level altitudes of Bodrogkerversztur graves and Baden hearth in their vicinity. There isn’t enough stratigraphic data for a claim that Bodrogkerversztur necropolis is younger then Baden settlement. Bearing in mind that all post Neolithic horizons at Vinča are severely devastated, the fact that one Bodrogkerversztur grave is 15 cm dug deeper then Baden hearth 2 m away, itself doesn’t speak in favor for late dating of Baden settlement.

---
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It is difficult to establish the exact position and thickness of the Baden culture horizon. If the criteria for determining its absolute position is the stratification of dug-out objects then the lowermost level is around 84.18 m while the upper most level is at 85.22 m sea-level altitude. Still, the limits of Baden horizon in Vinča vertical section aren’t clear since both the profiles from Vasić’ excavations and ones from 1978–1980. do not show exact stratigraphic position of post-Vinča settlements. It should be mentioned that according to B. Jovanović and M. Stevanović stratigraphic analysis of vertical sections at Vinča, Eneolithic, Bronze age and Medieval settlements are probably positioned between the present day surface and the depth of 1 meter, that is between 86.12 m and 85.12 m sea-level altitudes. Less reliable are M. Vasić’ observations regarding the stratification of Eneolithic horizons at Vinča. Under the term *Pannonian ware* M. Vasic considered the pottery of Baden, Kostolac and Vatin culture, which is positioned between the 3.90 m and 0.20 m in vertical section. Thus, the stratification of each post-Vinčan horizon cannot be studied separately from the conglomerate of Eneolithic horizon at Vinča. Under the term *Terminus ante quem* for Baden culture settlement. As it was shown earlier, there isn’t obvious clustering of Eneolithic objects in Vinča. Likewise in the terms of horizontal stratigraphy and distribution of Baden culture pottery in the cultural layer the only pattern that was observed follows the density and the degree of later devastations. That is, on the part of the settlement where the Eneolithic cultural layer is severely damaged with later Bronze Age dug-out pits (i.e. Blocks C–D/V) Baden and Kostolac culture pottery is less often found and it is usually heavily fragmented. On the other hand, bigger density and better perseverence of Eneolithic pottery in cultural layer is to be observed on the segments of site with the lesser post-depositional devastations (i.e. Blocks C/3, D–E/4).

**SUBSISTENCE AND ECONOMY**

Absence of solid above ground houses and different site organization are in direct link with pastoral and semi-nomadic based economy of the new occupants at Vinča. This time-period coincides with appearance of transhumant pastoralism in Southeastern Europe and the beginning of the so called *Secondary Product Revolution*. However, zoological analysis from Vinča showed that in comparison with late Neolithic settlement, there isn’t any significant shift in number of herding animals such as domestic sheep and goat. The most prominent substantial change that occurred during the life of the Baden culture settlement is the number of domestic pig, which increased almost double since the late Neolithic. Also, it is worth of mentioning that the number of domestic cattle declined since the latest Vinča settlement, at almost the same ratio.

Concluding remark on subsistence and economy of Eneolithic settlement at Vinča is in harmony with H. Greenfield’s analysis. It looks as at the beginning of Late Eneolithic the small Baden population settled at uninhabited Danube terrace in Vinča and built humble dug-out houses. Their economy was probably of mixed agro-pastoral character, with a great emphasis on fishing which is confirmed with well documented data on the significant presence of fish bones in the Baden culture pits. The vicinity of Vinča offered the same extent of natural resources as in Neolithic period: fertile plain which has been even easier cultivated since the invention of plough, enough easy accessible slopes for pasture, and the Danube, as the mightiest communicational route and a perennial source of fish and shell. Also, due to the invention of wheeled vehicles and the presence of traction animals Baden population at Vinča traveled, communicated and traded with less effort then Neolithic inhabitants did.

As attested from this short retrospection of Baden economy at Vinča, it is obvious that one should not consider all Late Eneolithic population as traveling, pastoral nomads with big herds moving from one pasture to another. Rather, it should be stressed that in many cases, subsistence and economy of Baden population had a dominant pastoral component, but also that leading subsistence components are closely associated with various socio-cultural and geo-economical factors. Therefore, mixed agro-pastoral economy of Baden po-
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population at Vinča is to be sought as a response to socio-cultural and natural conditions and needs of the time period and environment.

**MATERIAL CULTURE**

The most numerous part of finds discovered in the Baden culture horizon at Vinča are fragmented clay vessels, while worked bone and antler tools (pins, harpoons, hoes...) represent rather modest collection of finds from Baden settlement. Ground and chipped stone tools are found quite often at Vinča, but when they are found outside the pits or in a pit that was dug in to Vinča house their dating to Baden culture is conspicuous since the material itself is not datable. The most exceptional finds from Baden settlement at Vinča are four anthropomorphic figurines of *Die Kopflosidole* type.\(^{21}\) Besides those four finds, there is one more anthropomorphic figurine of the same type which was earlier erroneously dated to the late Vinča culture. Although it is a scarce find its Baden culture provenience is unquestionable.\(^{22}\) Until now, sites of Cernavodă, Vinča, Vučedol and Šarøvce remain as the only early Baden and Cernavodă–Boleráz settlements which yielded more than three such figurines.\(^{23}\) Baden figurines from Vinča were found outside the pits, in cultural layer. Similar find contexts were observed in Vučedol and Cernavodă also. Clear Kopflosidole find context is only to be observed in Šarøvce where more than ten anthropomorphic figurines were found in dugout ritual pit along with ceramic vessels. Therefore the meaning and interpretation of die Kopflosidole figurines is to be sought only within the cross-cultural analysis on a broader macro-regional scale, the task which exceeds the outlines of the current paper.

**POTTERY**

Repertoire of Baden culture vessels from Vinča includes all the basic forms and ornamental patterns typical for the post Boleráz or pre-classical phase of Baden culture, with the strong reminiscence on Boleráz–Cernavodă III culture pottery and a sort of prelude to the material culture patterns of classical Baden culture. M. Vasić was the first one to point out to the technology of his so called *Pannonian vere*, outlining the poorer quality of Eneolithic and Bronze Age pottery as opposed to perfectly refined and fired Vinčan *bucceo* ceramics.\(^{24}\) The same could be said now, some 70 years after Vasić’ analysis of small repertoire of Baden culture pottery. The vessels were made out of semi-fine and finely refined clay with inorganic and organic inclusions. The most common type of inclusions is sand, crushed shells and crushed ceramic sherds and white magnesite. There isn’t a strong relationship between the type and quantity of inclusion and type/size of the vessel. That is, at almost the same ratio appear small-sized vessels (i.e. cups, bowls) made out of poorly refined clay with big amount of sand and magnesite, and large-sized vessels (i.e. pots, amphorae, pithoi) made out of finely refined clay with small quantity of organic or inorganic inclusions, and *vice versa*. Vessels were handmade, and fired in oxidizing and reducing atmosphere. Finishing was executed by burnishing and polishing or by implementing some of the various ornamental techniques and motifs. Baden people from Vinča were skilled potters. The quality of their end-products is displayed through the harmony, symmetry, uniformity and typological diversity of vessel forms. Miniature vessels are the only exceptions to the remarkably modeled forms, being modeled very clumsily, often with asymmetrical walls, insufficiently dried and badly fired. Such properties and attributes could point out to hands of an unskilled craftsman or to the function of such items. Besides miniature vessels, spindle whorls are also carelessly modeled.

Basic forms of Baden culture ceramic vessels from Vinča–Belo Brdo include cups, bowls, pots, amphorae, pithoi, fischbuttegefäße and miniature vessels of various forms imitating the shapes of the full-size ones. Typological analysis of each studied form enables division of many subtypes and varieties.\(^{25}\) Cups with onion shaped belly are diagnostic vessel type of Baden culture, their lower part is usually vertically channelled with one ribbon handle which exceeds the height of the rim (Pl. I/3, 5–7).

---

\(^{21}\) Anthropomorphic figurines from Vinča were discussed in detail on other place, c.f. footnote 9.

\(^{22}\) Tasić 1995, 164, Fig. 45/3.

\(^{23}\) It is worth of mentioning that at Baden settlement Bolečica which is some 300 m from Vinča one more Kopflosidole was found (kind information of academian N. Tasić); for Cernavodă cf Roman 2001, 19, Taf. 2/1–8, Taf. 4/1–9; for Vučedol c.f. Težak-Gregl 1988, 11–21; For Šarøvce c.f. Novotný 1981, 130–138.

\(^{24}\) Bacith 1936, 136–138.

\(^{25}\) The text will not be burdened with proliferation of typological subdivisions of formal types and varieties of vessel. It is the author’s deepest conviction that exhaustive typological study has an enormous significance for the chronology and knowledge of material culture of prehistoric community, but also that minor deviations from the basic form doesn’t always signal the affinities, ambitions and changes in the studied cultural *milieu*. However, detailed typological schemes will be given in the plates at the end of the text.
Subtypes and varieties include forms of cups with different profilation of lips and the belly. Bowls are the most frequent type of vessel form in Baden settlement at Vinča–Belo Brdo (Pl. II–IV). This group of vessels is almost always decorated, so our knowledge of Baden culture ornamental techniques and motifs mainly depends on the study of those types of finds. The main types include spherical (Pl. II/2, 6, III/1/3), semispherical (Pl. II/4, 7–8), conical (Pl. II/1, 3, 5) and biconical bowls (Pl. III/5–7, IV/1–7). As the leading types appear conical and biconical bowls with $S$ profiled walls and fluted rim (Pl. III/7, IV/2–6). Spherical and semispherical bowls are also typical for early Baden culture, especially for Boleráz culture Eastern counterpart-Cernavoda III culture. Subtypes and varieties of bowls are distinguished on the basis of angle of profilation of the neck and rim. Besides bowls, pots make the most frequent type of vessel at Baden settlement (Pl. V/1–7, VI/1–6). Because of their size and the fact that most of the finds are heavily fragmented it was only possible to separate conical (Pl. V/3, VI/1–2), biconical pots (Pl. V/1) and $S$ profiled pots (Pl. V/6–7, VI/3, 5, VII/1–3), while the rest of the repertoire could be differentiated on the basis of variation in rim and neck profilation. Furthermore, pots are often decorated, also in a distinctive manner, typical just for this group of finds. Fragmentation and bad perseverance were also the problem dealing with typological study of amphora type vessel (Pl. VII/4–9, VIII/1, 3), because in many case, it was impossible to differentiate weather the studied fragment belongs to the pot or amphora. Amphorae with conical necks and narrow mouth are the only safely distinguished type of this vessel. Amphorae with impressed, crest modeled rim are found too. Also because of the bad perseverance of large sized vessels, pithoi are rarely found (Pl. VIII/4–5). In the case of the only one example of fishchuttegefäße vessel found at Vinča (Pl. VIII/2), it is even surprising having it in the early Baden culture period since their full affirmation is to be found only in late Baden, Kostolac and Vučedol culture. Repertoire of miniature vessels from Baden horizon at Vinča is very modest, it includes forms of pots and onion shaped cups.

Characteristic ornamental techniques and compositions on Baden culture pottery at Vinča signal out for a classical stylistic expression of Early Baden culture pottery production, with a certain degree of local distinctiveness (Fig. 2). The most common ornamental technique is incising which is executed before firing of the vessel. Rows of incised slanting lines, broom-strike and net-like motifs, fishbone, zigzag and triangular ornaments are executed either separately, as a single ornament or as an ornamental composition carried out in combination with different decorative technique. Stabbed dots, triangles and crescent shaped stabs are also performed on wet walls of the clay, either organized in horizontal or slanting parallel rows or in combination with incising. Both incised and stabbed ornaments are found on almost all types of vessel, with onion shaped cups as an only exception. On the contrary, horizontal rows of impressed fingers and fingernails below the rim, and applied stripes on the rim and below it, are exclusively found on the large-sized vessels such as pots, amphorae and pithoi. Channeling as a leading ornamental technique of the Baden culture pottery production appears only scarcely at Vinča, usually in a form of multiple vertical fields on the belly of onion shaped cups. Absence of channeling which is almost fundamental for understanding Baden culture stylistic expression is to be sought as a reflection of specific regional, socio-economic aspirations of Baden inhabitants at Vinča.

THE KOSTOLAC CULTURE SETTLEMENT

During the 20th century Kostolac culture settlement at Vinča was briefly evaluated by Serbian archaeologists. All of them came to the same conclusion, that small Kostolac population established settlement which was shortly inhabited, and that its cultural horizon cannot be distinguished in Vinča’ vertical section. In her study of Kostolac culture D. Nikolić also referred to settlement at Vinča, mainly focusing on the material from 1978–1983, excavations. Up to 1998 campaign, there wasn’t much to discuss about Kostolac settlement at Vinča owing to the fact that there was not a single Kostolac object excavated and that only about 30 vessel fragments were published. During the 1998. excavations, the most important Eneolithic find came to light, a Kostolac culture dug out ritual pit, containing assemblage of six intact and one fragmented clay vessels turned upside down. The find itself wasn’t of big help in solving the old problems, such as stratigraphy, settlement organization, subsistence and economy of the Kostolac culture horizon at Vinča, but its significance for the further study of Kostolac culture on the wider macro-regional scale is invaluable. Also, it points out to the conclusion,
purposed long ago by V. Milojčić, that Kostolac culture settlement at Vinča was of greater importance than archaeologists used to consider.\(^29\) As it was pointed out, there aren’t enough firm evidences for a wider discussion of Kostolac culture settlement organization at Vinča, subsistence and economy of its inhabitants. Therefore just a brief evaluation of ceramics will be given in the sequence.

**POTTERY**

Rather modest repertoire of Kostolac clay vessels consists of less then one hundred sherds and seven reconstructed vessels, which doesn’t allow broader typological and stylistic consideration. However, it could be stressed that vessels were mainly made out of fine refined clay mixed with crushed shells and sand, and fired in both reducing and oxidizing atmosphere. Outer surfaces are well burnished and decorated in well known Kostolac ornamental manner. Six basic types are distinguished: cups, bowls, pots, amphorae, pithoi and miniature vessels with quite small typological deviations and variations from the main type (Pl. IX–XI). One of the leading types of Kostolac culture vessels is small conical or biconical cup with high ribbon handle. Besides two fragments of decorated massive ribbon handles, only one cup was recovered from Vinča (Pl. IX/2). Conical, biconical and semispherical shapes are the most common types of bowls (Pl. IX/3–7, X/1–8, XI/1–4), the vast majority of which comprise of biconical bowls with various sub-types and varieties distinguished on the basis of distinct rim, neck and shoulder profilation (Pl. X/1–8, XI/1–4). Large-size vessels (i.e. pots, amphorae, pithoi) are very hard to identify because of their morphological resemblance with Baden culture counterparts. Thus the only secure attributed finds are ones from the Kostolac ritual pit. A real contribution to the knowledge of Kostolac pottery production is a miniature conical bowl decorated with square impressions (Pl. IX/1).

\(^{29}\) Milojčić 1949, 73.
It was outlined above that the leading vessel type of Kostolac culture is high-handled cup, likewise the same could be said for Furchenstich (stab and drag) ornamental technique which is taken as a synonym for the whole culture. The motifs executed in this technique comprise of simple linear ornaments such as single or multiple horizontal and vertical lines and some kind of chess fields, which are usually filled with white incrustation. Alternatively, Furchenstich is combined with stabbed ornaments. Still, the most common ornamental techniques and compositions are ones inherited from the Baden culture stylistic expression (Fig. 3), such as stabbed triangles, crescents, squares and dots organized in simple linear compositions like horizontal and vertical lines, hanging triangles and chess fields. Impressed and incised ornaments are rather rare, the only securely dated finds up to now are examples from ritual pit. In conclusion, it should be outlined that Kostolac culture ornamental system is far more sophisticated than it was observed on the material from Vinča. The reason for the modest stylistic expression at Vinča shouldn’t be explained as local degradation of Kostolac ornamental system. Rather, explanations for utterly limited corpus of applied ornamental motifs at Vinča are to be sought in

Ornamental techniques and compositions on pottery of Kostolac culture are quite uniform on the vast territory of Belgrade and its vicinity. More variations are to be observed only at macro-regional scale, such as it is in Eastern Serbia where Kostolac culture is under strong influence of Cotofeni culture and vice versa, or in Hungarian Transdanubia and southern Slovakia where Kostolac pottery production is under influence of local Early Furchenstisch traditions of Bajš-Relz-Gajary type.
the sphere of vivid processes that surrounded, to us still unrecognized, activities of Kostolac population at Vinča.

RELATIVE AND ABSOLUTE CHRONOLOGY

As it was shown, stratigraphic data doesn’t allow relative dating of Eneolithic horizons at Vinča, except the fact that it is well testified that Eneolithic horizons are younger then the late Vinčan settlement and older then Vatin culture layer. However, both Baden and Kostolac settlements from Vinča are securely dated via relative chronoology, owing to the presence of diagnostic vessel types and ornamentation on them. The division and evolution of Baden cultural complex on the territory of Central and Southeastern Europe, all of them being based on the typological and ornamental development of vessel types and ornamentation on them. Most appropriate chronological scheme for the territory of Serbia is the one proposed by S. Dimitrijević which is compatible and comparable with the chronology of V. Němejcová-Pavúková. According to Dimitrijević’ chronology, Baden settlement at Vinča fits into his A2 phase or the so called Fonyod horizon. This phase is synchronous with IIa phase in chronological system of V. Němejcová-Pavúková. The phase in question is in fact an early Baden culture period manifestation, which immediately follows Boleráz horizon in the Central Europe and Cernavoda III culture in the East. The material culture of this period is still under strong influence of the typological and ornamental patterns inherited from the Boleráz–Cernavoda III cultural complex. Diagnostic pottery forms and decoration that secure dating of Baden settlement at Vinča to an Early phase of Baden culture are small onion-shaped, channeled cups, S profiled conical and biconical bowls with fluted neck, deep bell-shaped and S profiled pots and amphorae, crest modeled rims of pots and amphorae, single or multiple applied plastic straps with finger, fingertip and nail impressions, incised zigzag and fishbone motifs, as well as anthropomorphic figurines of die Kopflossidole type. Material culture from Baden settlement at Vinča shows outstanding uniformity and cultural homogeneity. Studied pottery forms and motifs don’t allow distinguishing more then one cultural or building horizon at Vinča. A cup with long neck (Pl. I/7) and an example of fishbuttgefase (Pl. VIII/2) are the only finds which could signal for later dating of settlement at Vinča. Although mentioned finds are more typical for the later phase of Baden culture, as well as for Kostolac and Vučedol cultures, their presence in Early Baden context is well testified at the site of Sarvaš, while for the finds from Gomolava and Dobanovci–Ciglana somewhat later dating was proposed.

Vessel repertoire of Baden culture from Vinča is slightly remote from typological and ornamental style of Boleráz culture. Some basic forms of vessels and ornamentation on it, which survive from Boleráz to classical Baden culture, such as cups with pseudo-torded handles, jugs, bowls with inner channeled and incised rim and neck, plastically applied ribs, channeling, subcutaneous handles are all missing or are underrepresented at Vinča. On contrary, there is a strong resemblance with Cernavoda III culture material which reflects, before all, in vast appearance of spherical and semispherical bowls, but also in presence of combined incised and circular 36

31 There isn’t a single absolute C 14 date from post Vinčan horizons. Even Neolithic sequences of site are poorly dated (c.f. Schier 1996, 141–163).


33 Dimitrijević 1979, 209.

34 Němejcová-Pavúková 1981, 266, Obr. 3.


Central and Southeastern Europe with the synchronous manifestations in Upper Thrace, Greece and Aegean isn’t clear as it was thought. Although there is more then resemblance in the terms of vessels forms and decoration between Boleraz–Cernavoda III repertoire and material culture of Ezero XIII–IX and Dikili Tash–Sitagroi III, there is more then two century long chronological gap which doesn’t allow such synchronization.\(^{39}\) Therefore, it would be more reasonable to synchronize Ezero XIII–IX and Dikili Tash–Sitagroi III with Baden Ia, or to the so called post Boleraz horizon. N. Merpert came to the same conclusion in his discussion on relative chronology of Ezero.\(^{40}\)

In the terms of absolute dates and according to the relative chronology Baden culture settlement at Vinča can be dated to the period between 3400 and 3200 BC, which is in harmony with calibrated dates from the Baden Ib–IIa period.\(^{41}\)

Due to the fact that only one dug out object is securely attributed to Kostolac culture, the youngest Eneolithic settlement at Vinča is even harder datable. Concerning the attribution of finds from Kostolac ritual pit it should be stressed that vessels in question don’t exhibit significant chronological or even cultural sensitivity. However, finds are well dated because of uniformity in the ritus which is observed on the vast territory,\(^ {42}\) and because there are both typological and ornamental analogies in the repertoire from Gomolava IIIb2.\(^ {43}\) Also, there is strong resemblance with the material from the oldest Kostolac settlement at Golomava (IIIb1), before all in the prevalence of triangular, circular and crescent stabbed ornaments which are typical for Baden culture.\(^ {44}\) On the other hand, vessels decorated in Furchenstisch technique display rather modest repertoire of ornamental compositions which are usually combined with stabbed and pricked motifs. Following the relative chronological time span established for Golomava and Vinča, Kostolac settlement could be dated to the following cultural horizon: Golomava IIIb1–2–Karaburma–Gardoš–Dobanovci–Erdevik–Most II–Tri humke in Serbia, Vučedol–Sarvaš–Slavča in Croatia, with Kostolac manifestations of Hodmezovasarhely–Balatonboglaron–Ordaesehi/Major type in Hungary and with Kostolac culture influences in Southern Slovakia, as it is observed in Iza.\(^ {45}\) With respect of the existing chronological systems of Kostolac culture, future excavations will show whether it is possible to distinguish two phases of Kostolac culture settlement at Vinča: earlier one, which is represented in the cultural layer, and the later one which is registered in ritual pit. However, the problem of Kostolac culture intern periodisation is still an open question which needs to be answered. Careful examination of both typological and ornamental development and their sequencing in order implied by relative and absolute dating of their appearance is the only path which could solve the problem.

The question of possible synchronism of earlier Kostolac culture horizon with the later Baden culture one is still unclear because all such finds derive from an unclear context, that is from cultural layer. Still, in two Baden culture dug out pits (nos. 7a and 19) few fragments of Kostolac culture vessels were found. Pit 7a is heavily devastated with later Vatin culture pit. Deriving conclusion that there are evidences for contemporaneous habitation of Baden and Kostolac population at Vinča is still in the sphere of assumption, and needs to be attested in the course of new excavations.

There are only few absolute dates for Kostolac culture on the territory of Serbia, ones from Golomava and Vučedol are perhaps the most illustratable for Vinča.\(^ {46}\) Time span for both settlements is between 3100 and 2800 B.C. which is in harmony with Vinča. Hence, if there is synchronicity between late Baden and early Kostolac culture settlements, an earlier date for Kostolac settlement is also possible. Such high dating of Kostolac culture is also proven on Vučedol.\(^ {47}\)

**CONCLUSION**

Late Eneolithic settlements from Vinča–Belo Brdo offer a new insight into the social dynamics and life-biography of the settlement which is, with sometimes centuries long hiatuses, inhabited or used in some other ways, for more then seven millennia. During the time sequences in question the territory of Belgrade and its vicinity was densely populated, just to mention Baden.

---

38 Němejcová-Pavúková 1981, Obr. 6–10, 13, 14.
39 Wild et all 2001, 1062.
40 Mempir 1979, 497–520.
43 Petrović and Jovanović 2002, 289.
47 Nikolić 200, 77.
and Kostolac settlements at Bolečica, Beljarica, Zemun –Gardoš, Zemun–Surduk, Zemun–Prigrevica, Dobanovci –Ciglana, Karaburma, Rospi Ćuprija, Kalemegdan, Avala etc. Baden and Kostolac culture settlements at Vinča were built on a place which was prestigious even after the abandonment of the site by Late Neolithic occupants. There was lot of reasons for both Eneolithic populations to choose Vinča as their habitat. Although it is quite certain that Late Neolithic and Late Eneolithic inhabitants hardly ever met at Vinča, it is not questiona-
ble whether the later ones new for wealth, rank and re-
putation that had had settlement of their predecessors.
Thus by settling Vinča, newcomers could have obtained
the legitimacy to all of the socio-economic privileges and
rights that Vinčan population used to have. And what a
privileges that were! It would be redundant mentioning
diverse opportunities that natural environment offered
and what could have been the advantages and reputation
achieved by using and controlling them, on both micro
and macro-regional scale. Another question is if the
merchant connections and strains that Late Neolithic
inhabitants had remained and did the new-comers suc-
cceed to retrieve the existing ones or to build a new
network on their on. On the first glance it seems as they
didn’t accomplish any of it, since the settlement itself
doesn’t exhibit the importance of the Neolithic one. Yet,
we should not anticipate Neolithic settlement socio-cul-
tural and economic patterns in Late Eneolithic milieu.
With the respect of circumstances situation has changed
on a broader macro-regional scale since the abandon-
ment of the site by Late Neolithic occupants. Those
changes included shifts in the subsistence, economy,
transport, procurement and trade of raw materials. The
changes were sometimes gradual, other times abrupt.
Therefore, the place of Baden and Kostolac culture
settlement at Vinča in the Southeast European Late
Eneolithic oikoumene is to be sought in the sphere of
the temporal socio-economic trends and capability or
inability to follow them.
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Tekući rad predstavlja rezultate analiza badenskog i kostolackog naselja na čuvenoj lokalitetu Vinča–Belo Brdo, u blizini Beograda. Rеч је о инцидентном раду, уводу у серију студија које се односе на проблематику енеолитског периода у Београду и његовој околини. Добру основу за детаљну анализу енеолитских хоризоната на Винчи омогућили су резултати других и треће кампање систематских истраживања (1978–1986; 1998–2008), док су вези са појединим истраживачким питањима била референтна и запажања Милоја Васића, првог истраживача Винче. Разматрања о баденској и kostolackoj arhitekturi, horizontalnoj i vertikalnoj stratigrafiji i dinamici naсељавања била су донекле ограничена будући да су постинчанска насеља тешко децидирала укопима преко 900 средњовековних гробова. У оквиру истраженог дела баденског насеља установљено је укупно 17 укопаних објеката и једна надземна пећ. Уз извесну резерву може се рећи да су укопани објекти служили као станишта и отпали јаме. Такође, у раду је наглашено да се функционална улога укопаних објеката вероватно мењала у различитим временским секвенцима, у односу на исприценост њиховог функционалног квалитета, али и у односу на потребе балканских становника. Костолачко насеље је знатно мањег обима и вероватно је било краткотрајног карактера. На шесту другачије тумачење костолачког насеља наводе једини истражени објекат ове културе, укопана ритуална јама са седам очуваних судова. Материјали културе енеолитских становника Винче представљала је основ за проучавање економије, социо-културних и релативно-хронолошких односа на микрока и макро регионалној размери.

Детаљном анализом керамичког материјала из оба енеолитска хоризонта утврђено је да се насеље носилаца баденског и kostolackог насеља може везати за рану фазу ове културе, Баден A2 по С. Димитријевићу, односно за пост Болерас–Черновода III хоризонт, то јест Баден IIа по хронологији В. Немењове–Павукове. Учена је извесна локална особеност у орнаменти посеба од печене глине, која се огледа у великости и засланости узорака и у перспективизованом и локалношту орнаменталном систему. Ипак, керамички инвентар балканске културе и фамилија носилаца баденског и kostolackог насеља увек је изражавао видовне особености од сличних са сличним на простору Малој Европе.

Материјали културе kostolackог насеља такође не излазе из очуваних образаца kostolаке керамикографије, па је и однос врхом ограниченог броја налаза било могуће извођити два хоризонта. Старши хоризонт означен је налазима из културног слоја са добром аналогијом у Гомолова Шб1 слоју, док би најстарији постинчан слој из осталих насеља изразио видовне особености од сличних са сличним на простору Малој Европе.

**Кључне речи:** Винча, енеолит, балданска и kostolacka kultura, организација насеља, хронологија.
Plate I – 1, 6 (Block CIII/3), 2 (Block BIII/3), 3 (Block CIV/1–4), 4 (Block BIV), 5 (Block DIII/1), 7 (Block CIII/1), 8 (Block DIV/3), 9 (Block DIV)

Таблица I – 1, 6 (блок CIII/3), 2 (блок BIII/3), 3 (блок CIV/1–4), 4 (блок BIV), 5 (блок DIII/1), 7 (блок CIII/1), 8 (блок DIV/3), 9 (блок DIV)
Plate II – 1 (Block EIII/4), 2 (Block BIV/1–4), 3, 8 (Block DIV), 4 (Block EIII), 5 (Block EIII/4), 6 (Block DIII), 7 (Block CIV/1–4)

Tabla II – 1 (блок EIII/4), 2 (блок BIV/1–4), 3, 8 (блок DIV), 4 (блок EIII), 5 (блок EIII/4), 6 (блок DIII), 7 (блок CIV/1–4)
Plate III – 1 (Block CIII), 2, 5 (Block EIII), 3 (Block DIII/1), 4 (Pit 30), 6 (Block DIV/1–4), 7 (Block BIV)

Таблица III – 1 (блок CIII), 2, 5 (блок EIII), 3 (блок DIII/1), 4 (جما 30), 6 (блок DIV/1–4), 7 (блок BIV)
Plate IV – 1 (Block BIV/3), 2 (Block EIV/1), 3 (Block EIII–IV/1–3), 4 (Block CIV), 5 (Block DIV), 6 (Block BV/4), 7 (Block CIV/4)

Tabla IV – 1 (блок BIV/3), 2 (блок EIV/1), 3 (блок EIII–IV/1–3), 4 (блок CIV), 5 (блок DIV), 6 (блок BV/4), 7 (блок CIV/4)
Plate V – 1 (Block CIV/1–4), 2, 5 (Block BIV/1–4), 3 (Block DIII/1), 4 (Block DIV), 6 (Block DIII/1–4), 7 (Block BIV/1–2)

Табла V – 1 (блок CIV/1–4), 2, 5 (блок BIV/1–4), 3 (блок DIII/1), 4 (блок DIV), 6 (блок DIII/1–4), 7 (блок BIV/1–2)
Plate VI – 1 (Block DIII), 2, 4, 6 (Block DIII/1–4), 3 (Pit 7a), 5 (Block V/2)

Таблица VI – 1 (блок DIII), 2, 4, 6 (блок DIII/1–4), 3 (яма 7a), 5 (блок V/2)
Plate VII – 1, 3 (Block DIV), 2 (Block BIII), 4 (Block DIV), 5 (Block BIV/4), 6 (Block DIV/3), 7 (Block CIII), 8 (Block EIV/1–3), 9 (Block DIII)

Таблица VII – 1, 3 (блок DIV), 2 (блок BIII), 4 (блок DIV), 5 (блок BIV/4), 6 (блок DIV/3), 7 (блок CIII), 8 (блок EIV/1–3), 9 (блок DIII)
Plate VIII – 1 (Block DIV), 2 (Block DIV/1–4), 3 (Block DIII), 4 (Block EIII), 5 (Block CIII/1–4)

Таблица VIII – 1 (блок DIV), 2 (блок DIV/1–4), 3 (блок DIII), 4 (блок EIII), 5 (блок CIII/1–4)
Plate IX – 1 (Block DIV/4), 2 (Block EIII/4), 3 (Block CII/4), 4 (Block VIII–IV/I–2), 5 (Block CIII/I–3), 6 (Block DIV/I–4), 7 (Block EIV/I–2)

Plate X – 1 (Block BIII/3), 2, 4, 7 (Without position), 3 (Block CIII/1–3), 5 (DIV), 6 (Pit 7a), 8 (Block FIV/1)

Таблица X – 1 (блок BIII/3), 2, 4, 7 (без положения), 3 (блок CIII/1–3), 5 (DIV), 6 (жма 7a), 8 (блок FIV/1)
Plate XI – 1 (Block CII), 2 (Block EIII), 3 (Block CII/4), 4 (Block DIV), 5 (Block DIV), 6 (Block EIV), 7 (Block B–E/4)

Таблица XI – 1 (блок CII), 2 (блок EIII), 3 (блок CII/4), 4 (блок DIV), 5 (блок DIV), 6 (блок EIV), 7 (блок B–E/4)