

# THE IDENTIFICATION AND LOCATION OF “BASE ∇9.3” AT VINČA

**Dubravka Nikolić**

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade

**Abstract:** *Through the cross-checking of the archaeological material, Field Notes 1931 and published data, an attempt was made to establish the exact character and location of a feature mistakenly named as “base ∇9.3”. It was actually one of the pits which was, probably due to bigger daub pieces and higher daub concentration, prematurely marked as a “base” – a term which in the works of M. Vasić, the first excavator of Vinča, usually implies a rectangular structure at ground level. Instead of being the base of a building, as suggested by the name, “base ∇9.3” turned to be a pit from Vinča culture, the digging of which partly disturbed the contents of the Starčevo tomb located below.*

**Key words:** *Vinča, “base ∇9.3”, pit, pottery, stratigraphy, Starčevo tomb, settlement.*

To date small finds from Vinča have mostly been interpreted according to the “mechanical” classification of the cultural strata (which at some points exceeds a depth of 9 m). Namely, the finds have been grouped in units solely on the principle of the relative depth at which they were found. In other words, the units, except for the pits dug into virgin soil and the stratum directly above the pits (up to the depth of 8 m), represent the contents of 2 m thick, artificially separated, layers (Vasić 1910; *idem* 1936b; *idem* 1936c). Vasić’s methodological approach, which could be criticized from the modern archaeology point of view, is also applied to closed-finds, *i.e.* artefacts from a sealed context, which, in addition to the modest scope of the published technical documentation, now allows only tentative typological comparisons. As a result, most of the previous classifications of the Vinča layers have been driven by the typological characteristics of the finds, while many important issues – such as the shape, size and disposition of architectural structures, the character of superposed settlements and social and economic aspects – have remained out of focus.

Diverse methodological approaches and the scope and type of the available documents have resulted in different interpretations of the Neolithic settlements at Vinča (*e.g.* Korošec 1953; Chapman 1981; Сталио 1984). However, agreement has been reached on a single issue: all researchers have accepted

Vasić's assumption (1936a: 9) that the oldest settlement – unlike the later ones which all had structures above ground level – was a “pit-dwelling” settlement.<sup>1</sup> For instance, Korošec (1953) distinguishes 12 occupational horizons based on the published archaeological plans with the marked relative stratigraphic depths. Relying on the only published profile (Vasić 1910: fig. 7), the data on different relative depths of the virgin soil in the sections excavated in 1908 and the campaigns in 1931 and 1934, and on two drawings in colour of profiles without marked levels and without the definition of their positions inside the excavated sections, Chapman (1981: 9) makes an attempt at reconstructing the stratigraphy of Vinča: he concludes that “11 periods (10 building levels and a pit-level)” can be distinguished. Along the same lines, Stalio (Сталио 1984) uses partly unpublished documentation trying not only to reconstruct the stratigraphy of Vinča, but also to present what each settlement looked like and how it was organized. Her analysis has led her to the conclusion that there were 9 building horizons at Vinča (*loc. cit.*). However, on the site plans, the structures remain almost completely unidentified – probably because of the incompleteness of Vasić's documentation due to loss during the wars at the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century which has broken the connections between those parts of the documentation which still exist.

Even a brief look at the documentation kept at the National Museum and the Archaeological Collection of the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade reveals the fact that establishing a connection between the field notes and the often unmarked plans and photographs is not an easy or simple task. However, there are still many possibilities of analysing the unpublished documentation and the small finds in order to fill at least some gaps in our understanding of the eponymous site of the Vinča culture.

Such an approach is used to explain a feature known as “base ∇9.3” (“*osnova ∇9,3*”), which, due to its character and position, should be taken into consideration when the oldest settlement at Vinča is being discussed, particularly in the light of the still unclear relationship between dug-in and above-ground structures. Furthermore, it seems that the clarifying of the stratigraphic position and contents of that feature may allow better insight into the chronological and cultural relations between the Starčevo and Vinča cultures at the site of Vinča.

It should be stressed that Vasić's field notes offer little information on “base ∇9.3”. A few incomplete and sporadic remarks in some of Vasić's records dealing with the various aspects of the Neolithic settlements at Vinča (*e.g.* Vinča 1932: 101, 118; *idem* 1936a: fig. 8) – should lead a careful reader to the conclusion that “base ∇9.3” is, as far as stratigraphy is concerned, above a tomb with

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Vasić's term pit-dwelling was broadly accepted, the present author's opinion is that the named features were actually, in most cases, only simple pits, whose rims were recorded at a relative depth of 8.9–9.3 m (*cf.* Vasić 1936a: fig. 8).

nine skeletons.<sup>2</sup> By reconsidering the significance which Vasić attributes to this tomb in his interpretation of Vinča (1932; *idem* 1936a; *idem* 1936c; *idem* 1948), we have arrived at the tempting idea of using “base ∇9.3” to achieve a better understanding of the earliest stratigraphic and cultural contexts at Vinča.<sup>3</sup>

The “base” at the depth of ∇9.3 m, that we assume can be identified with the feature “base ∇9.3”, is mentioned in Vasić’s works for the first time without clear reference to a particular structure: “Rectangular bases, characteristic of the upper layers above the pit-dwelling structures, have been noted at the depth of ∇9.3 m, and the remains of kilns for the roasting of cinnabar at the depth of ∇9.2 m provide evidence that, even at the time when the pit-dwelling structures were occupied, kilns were used for processing cinnabar” (Vasić 1932: 101, – note that his view of “kilns for the roasting of cinnabar” was not accurate, and what we actually had here were simply ovens for food processing). From these words one may assume that at Vinča there were several rectangular bases at the depth of 9.3 m and several ovens at the depth of 9.2 m, and that the named features were located in different sections of the excavated area. There is an additional remark, but also without a clear reference to a particular “base ∇9.3”: “The peripheries of some pit-dwelling structures reach ∇9.1 m, but the remains of rectangular bases are found even at ∇9.3 m” (Vasić 1936a: 14).

The lack of data dealing with the dimensions and exact positions of “base ∇9.3”, opens several questions, especially in regard to Vasić’s claims that “pit-dwelling” (see note 1) structures and subsequent settlement with above-ground structures can be clearly distinguished in terms of stratigraphy and chronology (1936a: 9). Let us stress that his claims have never been doubted or disputed by later researchers (*cf.* Letica 1968; Chapman 1981; Schier 1996).

As we have already noted, a feature defined as “base ∇9.3” cannot be found in any of the few of Vasić’s archaeological plans and photographs available: neither on the plan of the surface structures, showing “the situation of excavated remains of buildings, excavation depth 6–9 m” (Vasić 1936a: fig. 210) – perhaps because it lay below ∇9.0 m – nor in the plan of the “pit-dwelling layer 9.0–11.4” (*ibid.*: fig. 209), perhaps because it was not considered a pit-dwelling, but rather as a rectangular structure above the ground surface. Here we should recall Vasić’s argument that the pit-dwelling structures at Vinča represent “only the first temporary shelters”, which were “later, after a still undefined in-

<sup>2</sup> The tomb containing nine bodies, that actually belonged to Starčevo culture, was also known by the erroneous names “ossuary”, “tomb with entrance hall – dromos” and “pit-dwelling Z” (Vasić 1932: 26; *idem* 1936a: 9; *idem* 1936c: 150).

<sup>3</sup> We should note that there is a stratigraphic profile obtained as the result of the excavation of a Trial Trench in 1978–1980, near the so-called Vasić’s “trench P/1934” (Stevanović and Jovanović 1996) close to the tomb. However, 1978–1980 excavations were not made exactly “along” the line of Vasić’s trench, because up to 2 m of the terrain at Vasić’s profile actually collapsed between 1934 and 1978 (*cf. ibid.*: fig.1), so the important detail of the stratigraphy may be lost.

terval, replaced by rectangular buildings with flat floors” (1936a: 9). Accordingly, all pit-like features, regardless of the portable finds which they contained, were seen as “pit-dwellings” (see note 1) that were made simultaneously, and considered to be chronologically earlier than the above-ground structures. This perhaps may be the reason why the supposedly rectangular “base ∇9.3”, which in terms of its relative depth would belong to the layer of pit-dwellings and thought to be contemporary with them, is not mentioned in Vasić’s later works. Nonetheless, at one point it is stated that it is not certain whether the post-holes noted at ∇9.3 m belong to the layer of pit-dwelling structures or the layer of rectangular buildings (Vasić 1948: 101).

An additional detail helps clarify, at least to a certain extent, the problem of the position of “base ∇9.3”. There is a figurine, said to have come from a house base at ∇9.3 m “under which an ossuary [see note 2] was later detected” (*idem* 1932: 118). This establishes an important spatial and stratigraphic relation between “base ∇9.3” and the tomb (erroneously denoted “ossuary”) that, judging from its contents, belonged to Starčevo culture (Letica 1968; Гапашанин 1984). The position of the tomb is precisely defined (Vasić 1936a: 9) and it can be seen in archaeological plans from 1931 and 1934, showing the rims of “pit-dwellings” noted at the loess level (*ibid.*: fig. 8, 209; cf. Nikolić 2006: fig. 2). When the first volume of *Prehistoric Vinča* (Vasić 1932) was being written, only the south-eastern section of the tomb had been unearthed, since no other area than the one leased in 1911 where the section is located had been fully excavated. Therefore, the established stratigraphic relation between the “base ∇9.3” and the tomb refers to the south-east section of the tomb, uncovered in 1931. Although inadequate to provide complete data, such as a ground plan or dimensions of “base ∇9.3”, its connection with the tomb suggests that the both entities lay, more or less, at the same place – in the corner between the south west profile of the area excavated 1911–1931 and the south-east profile of trench P that was opened later (Vasić 1936a: fig. 8).

Moreover, there is some, albeit somewhat contradictory, data concerning the contents of “base ∇9.3” that seems to support the reconstruction of its exact location. The “base ∇9.3”, or “house base at ∇9.3 m” is explicitly mentioned in relation to the fragmented figurine No. 856 that “was found on the rectangular base of the house at ∇9.3 m” (Vasić 1932: 118). It is well known (cf. Јовановић 1984) that Vasić paid most of his attention to small finds and carefully registered the depth and unit in which the items had been found consistently, not only in his publications, but also written on the objects themselves. However, in two photographs of the figurine,<sup>4</sup> that was previously said to have been found “on the base of a house at ∇9.3 m”, Vasić’s mark – “*under* base ∇9.3” can be seen [emphasis added] (1932: T. 30, fig. 135a-b). The very same figurine, again said to

<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, the mark on the figurine itself is no longer legible.

have been “found under the base of a house at ∇9.3” was published four years later in the volume on Vinča figurines (Vasić 1936b: 9, fig. 27).<sup>5</sup>

The contents of “base ∇9.3” also seem to encompass the fragment of a prosopomorphic lid, a biconical bowl and an object of polished calcite. One should bear in mind that “base ∇9.3” was unearthed in 1931, during the excavation campaign that was particularly important for Vasić, since the excavation of the area leased in 1911 was completed and the most interesting and most important discovery was made – on August 8<sup>th</sup>, 1931 – the tomb (see note 2).<sup>6</sup> The Field Notes 1931 report that on July 30<sup>th</sup> work was going on “in the layer of original humus”. All small finds registered on that day bear the mark ∇9.1 m (Vasić 1931: 111). The entry of August 1<sup>st</sup> reads: “We are still working in the layer which is sterile everywhere but in the corner near oven ∇8.725. Here, where in the afternoon a oven was found at ∇9.2 Mr. Braun finds pits created by house beams (...) Together with the oven at ∇9.2 m, the following was also found *on the base* at ∇9.3 m [emphasis added]: a) a fragment of prosopomorphic lid; b) a fragment of a fossil of shellfish; c) a piece of petrified wood, partly polished in preserved length of 8.7 cm; d) Brettspiel – an alabaster figurine, almost whole – 2.6 cm high; e) fragments of a cup with radial graphite ornaments on the outer side” (Vasić 1931: 112). This entry may be interpreted to mean that all the objects listed under a-e were found on the base at ∇9.3 m.

It seems obvious that “the base at ∇9.3” and the “oven at ∇9.2” represent one, not two features, as one may infer from Vasić’s later works (*cf.* 1932: 101; *idem* 1948: 103), and that “holes created by beams at 9.3”, mentioned in his study with caution (Vasić 1948: 101), were actually located at the same spot where “base ∇9.3” lay. In addition, the reference to oven ∇8.725 points closely to the place where the remains of base ∇9.3 could have been found. That oven was located north of base ∇7.850 (*idem* 1936a: fig. 210), which is shown in the plan with above-ground structures. By comparing that plan with the plan showing the rims of the “pit-dwelling” structures (*ibid.*: fig. 209), the conclusion can be drawn that the oven lay above the northern section of the “ossuary”, or more precisely above the northern section of the “*dromos*”.<sup>7</sup> This indirectly confirms that “base ∇9.3” lay above the tomb.

Further comparison between Vasić’s Field Notes 1931 and his publications reveals a few more details. Luckily, most of the mentioned objects are ac-

<sup>5</sup> The same figurine is obviously associated with two different contexts. It is interesting to note that that figurine was not published in Chapter “Terracotta from pit-dwelling structures”, but in the following Chapter “Terracotta from layer ∇9.4–∇8.0 m”. There is a certain contradictoriness concerning the virgin soil and cultural layer: there is a remark that almost ideally horizontal virgin soil is reached at the relative depth of 9.1–9.3 m, whereas simultaneously the content of the “cultural layer” that lies *under* the loess surface (*i.e.* into the virgin soil), is presented.

<sup>6</sup> Note that the tomb discovery was preceded by the excavation of “base ∇9.3”.

<sup>7</sup> An absolute matching of those plans can not be made, despite they supposedly having been drawn to the same scale.

accompanied with a short description and dimensions, and often with a drawing. This allows reliable identification, even if there is a discrepancy between the data related to the archaeological context, as is the case of the finds associated with “base ∇9.3”. It is important that a fragment of prosopomorphic lid is mentioned – without a detailed description, dimensions or a drawing, though. Nevertheless, it is likely to be identified with the published fragment which is said to “have been found on the base at ∇9.3” (Vasić 1936a: 68, fig. 106).<sup>8</sup>

The next item which can be positively identified, because it is accompanied by a drawing, is a so-called *Brettspiel* – a figurine of “alabaster” which, according to the publication (*ibid.*: 105, fig. 199), was located “under the base at ∇9.3m”. This object of polished calcite is classified in the category of board game figurines. The mark “base ∇9.3” can be seen in the picture (Vasić 1936a: 105, fig. 199), but the mark on the object itself is not visible any more.

The last identified find from “base ∇9.3” is represented by “fragments of a cup with radial graphite ornaments on the outer side”. Although those fragments appear in the field notes without dimensions or drawings, they can be recognized in the biconical bowl with polished ornaments bearing the mark “base ∇9.3” (Vasić 1936c: fig. 12). On the photograph of the “reliably restored biconical bowl” there is a visible mark (*loc. cit.*).<sup>9</sup>

Judging from the quoted examples – which demonstrate that in this particular case the Field Notes 1931 and published data relate the very same objects to different contexts – one could conclude that perhaps it may not have been possible to define “base ∇9.3” precisely during the 1931 excavation and that, at the time when the material was published, Vasić was still not quite sure if the “base ∇9.3” and “oven at ∇9.2” indeed represented the remains of an above-ground structure.

This assumption seems to be confirmed by the Field Notes 1931 that indicate that by the end of the excavation Vasić did not resolve his doubts about the real function of “base ∇9.3”. The following was recorded on August 4<sup>th</sup>: “∇9.3 – the base around the oven at ∇9.2 has been examined. It leads to a deeper section – that is to say a pit – pit dwelling” (Vasić 1931: 116). As we have already said, this is followed by a short list of the finds from the “pit – pit dwelling”. The quoted note explains that it was a pit which most likely was not easy to notice at the loess level. Pieces of daub (from the oven at ∇9.2 m?) are probably secondary contents of the pit, like all other small finds noted there on August 1<sup>st</sup>, 1931 and the following several days.

A record entered on August 5<sup>th</sup>, 1931 indicates that “base ∇9.3” was not perceived as the remains of an above-ground structure, but rather as a pit

<sup>8</sup> The fragment of prosopomorphic lid is not in the Archaeological Collection any more, neither is Vasić’s mark visible on the published photos (Vasić 1936a: fig.106).

<sup>9</sup> Unfortunately, the bowl is now fragmented and the part with Vasić’s mark is missing.

which had not been noted before that depth, although most probably its rim laid in the “original humus” layer. The entry reads as follows: “Clearing of a few suspicious places. Especially in a corner of the base at ∇9.3. Black soil appears in this base in the very corner of the excavated section. It is mixed with fine lumps of baked earth and less frequent fragments of pottery” (Vasić 1931: 116). It is obvious that this has to do with the pit referred to in the entry of the previous day which was first defined under the level where daub assigned to the “base at ∇9.3” appeared.

The following field notes entry of August 6<sup>th</sup>, 1931 confirms that excavation, *i.e.* clearing of a sunken-in structure, was in progress: “Work on sketches continued. Six workers worked on excavation of the spot at base ∇9.3 with the same success and results as yesterday. Earth is being screened for fragments. In the morning the following was found in that pit: Base ∇9.3 – body of a decapitated earthen statuette. Short, pierced stumps. Sculptured breasts. Preserved height 4.1 cm. Remark: Up to now the oldest pierced stumps were found at ∇8 m. For the time being this item is the oldest one. It belongs to the earliest layer; so consequently, the custom of tying a deity was known at Vinča from the establishment of this settlement” (Vasić 1931: 117). In addition to the description, a drawing in the margin helps to confirm the identification of this figurine. The figurine can also be recognized in the publication in an item illustrated with the same photographs but accompanied with different information concerning the context of the find (Vasić 1932: 118; *idem* 1936b: 9). The field notes entry made the same day also reads: “In the afternoon, at ∇10.29 in the same pit under the base at ∇9.3, in black soil, a whole human mandible was found” (*idem* 1931: 117).

The last entry in the Field Notes 1931 in which a reference to “base ∇9.3” is made tells us that on August 7<sup>th</sup> a human skull was found at ∇10.70 m during clearing of “the section – depression under base ∇9.3” (Vasić 1931: 118). It should be stressed that the field notes present the mandible and the skull as the contents of the “pit”, *i.e.* the “depression under base ∇9.3”. However, the studies on the tomb emphasize that – beside a skeleton at the bottom of the grave pit – parts of skeletons in the so-called “*dromos*” and “outside the tomb” were found at different depths, but no explanation for their appearance there is given (Vasić 1936a: 10). No further reference to base ∇9.3 is made in the subsequent section of the Field Notes 1931 which describes works on the examination of the tomb.

All in all, the limited scope of available data concerning “base ∇9.3” hardly seems to provide enough evidence that the “base” belongs to a rectangular above-ground structure, especially since the existence of such a structure is hardly to be expected in the “pit-dwelling layer”. The assumption that “base ∇9.3” is actually a pit-dwelling, since it lacks the elements that characterize rectangular houses, is made by Korošec (1953: 10) who – due to Vasić’s note on the

stratigraphic relations between “base ∇9.3” and the tomb – argues that the so-called “base ∇9.3” could have been part of a pit-dwelling Z that was later in secondary use as a tomb. Although Korošec (1950) correctly pointed out that the tomb can be assigned to Starčevo culture, he fails to note the difference between the contents of the tomb and “base ∇9.3”. His assumption – that the very same single structure is in question – is probably based on the view that all pits at Vinča contained material of both Starčevo and Vinča cultures (*idem* 1953: 12).

Unlike the technical documentation, all Vasić’s field notes from the 1911–1934 excavations are preserved. In spite of possible criticism of the manner in which they were kept, they are of great importance for research on Vinča and represent an indispensable and sometimes the sole source of information.

## DISCUSSION

By summing up all the information provided by the Field Notes 1931, it becomes clear that the only work done in the last few days of the campaign was emptying of the pits dug into loess and the discovery of the skeletons in the Starčevo tomb. The Field Notes 1931 undoubtedly suggest that the “base ∇9.3” is only one of the pits which was, probably due to bigger pieces and higher daub concentration at ∇9.2 m, prematurely marked as a “base” – a term which in Vasić’s work always implies a rectangular structure above the ground surface.

Although the Field Notes 1931, along with the entries describing field work, also include Vasić’s reflections and conclusions concerning the phenomena observed during excavation and corrections of wrongly or imprecisely defined finds, in the case of “base ∇9.2” this was not done – it was not renamed or correctly marked as a pit. The excitement over the discovery of the tomb with nine skeletons may have redirected the focus, pushing the pit dilemma aside, but it still remains unclear why in the later publication it was not renamed and connected with the pits in the “layer with pit-dwelling structures” (Vasić 1936a: 8).

Its measurements, the level at which the rim lay and the depth up to which it was dug will remain unknown. Some elements seem to indicate the possibility that “base ∇9.3” represents one of the most deeply dug pits. Parts of skeletons, presented as the pit contents in the Field Notes 1931, but as the tomb contents in Vasić’s publication, were found above skeleton 1 at significantly higher levels and at about the depths at which the bottoms of other pits at Vinča were noted (Vasić 1932: fig. 8). Their occurrence at those depths, which cannot be interpreted as the pit contents but as a result of disturbance of the tomb while digging a later Vinča pit, may at the same time indicate the depth up to which the Vinča pit was dug. The number and position of the undisturbed skeletons in the Starčevo tomb below the pit confirms that it was not dug much deeper.

The small finds from the pit and the tomb also corroborate the assumption that the Vinča pit did not seriously disturb the Starčevo tomb. The finds in



question are 93 pottery fragments with inscribed mark – “base ∇9.3” – which now belong to the study-collection. Study of this material, kept in the Archaeological Collection of the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade and not mentioned in the Field Notes or subsequent publications, reveals the typological features which indisputably associate it with the finds from the deepest Vinča layers, as well as to the contents of the pits dug into the loess. By contrast, pottery from the tomb, somewhat greater in quantity, displays completely different features, clearly belonging to the Starčevo culture. It is possible that the outline of the pit could not be precisely defined during the excavation, so presumably this led to assigning of two Vinča pottery fragments (*i.e.* from Vinča culture pit) to the contents of the Starčevo culture tomb (Letica 1968).

This detail seems also to be related to the contents of the second part of the tomb, excavated in 1934 – the whole structure was then named “pit-dwelling Z” (see note 2). There is no information as to whether any remains of a structure, which could possibly be connected to “base ∇9.3”, were noted above the tomb (*i.e.* “pit-dwelling Z”). Considering the contents of that particular section of “pit-dwelling Z”, the possibility that the base was not wholly excavated in 1931 cannot be excluded (Vasić 1934). Two Starčevo vessels and a small number of pottery fragments can be seen as the expected contents of a tomb where bearers of the Starčevo culture were buried, but the presence of five Vinča-style figurines in the tomb is difficult to explain (Vasić 1936b: 18–22; Letica 1968). Given the almost regular presence of such figurines in Vinča pits, one cannot help thinking that the figurines assigned to “pit-dwelling Z” actually came from a later Vinča pit dug into the Starčevo tomb. However, it should be noted that the Field Notes of 1934 do not provide any indications regarding the existence of such a Vinča pit above “pit-dwelling Z”. In spite of this, the presumption that a part of “base ∇9.3” was excavated in 1934 and that the Vinča figurines should be regarded as part of the contents of that pit seems well grounded.

The identification of the “base ∇9.3” feature is important for the better understanding of the methodology applied by Vasić. His field notes, not necessarily always in accordance with his later publications, have proved to contain important information about the small finds and the architectural structures alike. Knowledge of the latter is a precondition for the proper reconstruction of the dwelling horizons at Vinča. Therefore, a careful reading of the field notes and cross-referencing with the information available in Vasić’s published works seems necessary.

For instance, the Field Notes 1931 entries referring to this feature consistently point out that it was “base ∇9.3” that was being excavated, but there is no doubt that in the days preceding the discovery of the first whole skeleton in the Starčevo tomb, “base ∇9.3” was being excavated and tentatively defined as any of the previously excavated pits. If this understanding of the Field Notes 1931 entries is correct, the question arises why this pit, documented by its contents and entries, does not appear in Vasić’s later publications. Furthermore, why is an above-

-ground structure at ∇9.3 referred to at all – even in the form of sporadic and contradictory remarks – when its existence is practically not confirmed?

In the case of “base ∇9.3 with the oven at ∇9.2” one can presume that what Vasić actually accentuates is rather the importance of “the kiln at ∇9.2”, since its presence in the “pit-dwelling layer” may support his assumption that cinnabar was processed even at the time when the first “pit-dwelling settlement” was founded at Vinča, and consequently suggests the conclusion concerning the primary reason for foundation of the Vinča settlement. At this moment the main reasons for leaving the pit under “base ∇9.3” out of the checklist and the archaeological plan of the pit-dwelling settlement seem likely to be found in Vasić’s interpretation of the “ossuary”, or more specifically in his statement that “in terms of stratigraphy and chronology the ossuary with an entrance hall can be associated with the layer and period of pit-dwelling structures” (Vasić 1931: 102). In this context, although the chronological relations of the Starčevo tomb and the so-called pit-dwellings have been partly resolved, it should be noted that reconstruction of the stratigraphic position and contents of the pit under “base ∇9.3” raises the possibility of their more comprehensive analysis. The Filed Notes 1931 show that above the Starčevo tomb there was a Vinča pit, partly dug into it. Since the digging of the pit had not seriously disturbed the contents of the Starčevo tomb (pottery material was not mixed up and the skeletons at the bottom of the pit were not disturbed at all), their chronological relation should be looked into more carefully. Considering the lack of agreement on whether it is in fact a Starčevo tomb, as well as its precise dating (Arandelović-Garašanin 1954: 22; Garašanin 1979: 143; Гарашанин 1984: 21; Сталио 1984: 35), the problem can hardly be solved without familiarization with the small finds from both “base ∇9.3” and the tomb, that, unfortunately, still await publication.

## REFERENCES

- Arandelović-Garašanin, D.  
1954 *Starčevačka kultura*. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani.
- Chapman, J.  
1981 *The Vinča culture of South-East Europe*. BAR International Series 117. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
- Гарашанин, Д.  
1984 Насеље старчевачке културе. Стр. 13–21 у *Vinča у праисторију и средњем веку*, ур. С. Ђелић. Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности.
- Garašanin, M.  
1979 Centralnobalkanska zona. Str. 79–212 u *Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja II: neolitsko doba*, ур. А. Бенас. Сарајево: Svjetlost i Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine.

- Јовановић, Б.  
 1984 Насеље винчанске културе – стратиграфија. Стр. 23–34 у *Винча у праисторији и средњем веку*, ур. С. Ђелић. Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности.
- Короџес, Ј.  
 1950 Grobovi u Vinči. *Arheološki vestnik* 1/1-2: 156–169.  
 1953 Delitev vinčanske kulturne plasti. *Arheološki vestnik* 4/1: 5–46.
- Letica, Z.  
 1968 Starčevo and Korös Culture at Vinča. *Archaeologia Iugoslavica* 8: 11–18.
- Nikolić, D.  
 2006 On the Issue of Fortifications at Vinča. *JSAS* 22: 9–22.
- Schier, W.  
 1996 The Relative and Absolute Chronology of Vinča: New Evidence from the Type Site. Pp. 141–162 in *The Vinča Culture, its Role and Cultural Connections*, ed. F. Drasovean. Timisoara: The Museum of Banat.
- Сталио, Б.  
 1984 Насеље винчанске културе – насеље и стан. Стр. 34–41 у *Винча у праисторији и средњем веку*, ур. С. Ђелић. Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности.
- Stevanović, M., and Jovanović, B.  
 1996 Stratigraphy of Vinča-Belo Brdo Reconsidered. *Сџаринар* (н.с.) 47: 193–204.
- Vasić, M.  
 1910 Die Hauptergebnisse der prähistorischen Ausgrabung in Vinča im Jahre 1908. *Prähistorische Zeitschrift* 2: 23–39.  
 1931 Дневник ископавања 1931 (у рукопису, Народни музеј, Београд).  
 1932 *Преисториска Винча* 1. Београд: Државна штампарија.  
 1934 Дневник ископавања 1934 (у рукопису, Народни музеј, Београд).  
 1936a *Преисториска Винча* 2. Београд: Државна штампарија  
 1936b *Преисториска Винча* 3. Београд: Државна штампарија.  
 1936c *Преисториска Винча* 4. Београд: Државна штампарија.  
 1948 Јонска колонија Винча. *Зборник Филозофског факултета у Београду* 1: 85–235.

ДУБРАВКА НИКОЛИЋ

## ИДЕНТИФИКАЦИЈА И ЛОКАЦИЈА „ОСНОВЕ ∇9,3” НА ВИНЧИ

### Резиме

Највећу пажњу приликом публиковања резултата истраживања Винче Васић је посветио покретним налазима, док су грађевински објекти остали у другом плану. Због тога се проблем реконструкције грађевинских, односно стамбених хоризоната у културном слоју, који је на неким местима дебљи од 9 m, намеће као један од основних предуслова за целовито сагледавање Винче. Досадашњи покушаји реконструкције представљају, углавном, само интер-

претацију публиковане техничке документације, сведене на неколико ситуационих планова и један профил. Увид у непубликовану документацију, која се чува у Народном музеју и Археолошкој збирци Филозофског факултета у Београду, показује да и она представља изузетно важан, у неким случајевима изгледа и важнији, извор информација неопходних за сагледавање грађевинских хоризоната на Винчи. Базирано на непубликованој документацији, учињен је покушај тумачења, утврђивања положаја, изгледа и садржаја „основе V9,3”. Васићеви публиковани радови пружају веома мало релевантних информација о „основи V9,3”, о чијем тачном положају и изгледу практично нема готово никаквих података. На малобројним плановима и фотографијама она се не може препознати ни лоцирати. Из спорадичних и узгредних напомена може се закључити да је тај објекат у стратиграфском смислу у вези са „костурницом”, односно „гробницом са дромосом” (оба термина су неодговарајућа, пошто је у питању једноставна гробница са инхумираним покојницима), која је на основу свог садржаја приписана старчевачкој култури. Насупрот томе, белешке у Дневнику ископавања за 1931. годину пружају нешто више информација. Оне показују да се последњих дана те истраживачке кампање радило само на пражњењу јама укопаних у лес, а потом и на откривању скелета у поменутој „гробници са дромосом”. Такође, оне откривају да „основа V9,3” не представља надземни правоугаони објекат, већ винчанску јаму делимично укопану у старчевачку гробницу. Јама је, преурањено, вероватно због већих комада или веће концентрације лепа на коти V9,2 m, означена као основа надземног објекта. Њен положај је у дневнику наведен, односно, каже се да се тај објекат налази у близини пећи на V8,725 која је приказана на публикованом плану са надземним објектима. Димензије јаме, ниво на коме се налазио обод и дубина до које је била укопана остају непознати. Више елемената указује на могућност да „основа V9,3” заправо представља једну од најдубље укопаних јама. На то упућује чињеница да су делови скелета који се у теренском дневнику помињу као садржај јаме – док су у Васићевим радовима наведени као садржај гробнице – нађени знатно изнад скелета бр. 1, на дубинама на којима су, приближно, констатована дна осталих винчанских јама. Делови скелета на тим дубинама, који би се могли објаснити не као садржај јаме, већ као последица поремећаја гробнице приликом укопавања млађе, винчанске јаме, истовремено би указивали и на дубину до које је винчанска јама укопана. Да она није била укопана дубље, сведоче положај и број непоремећених скелета у старчевачкој гробници испод ње. На примеру „основе V9,3” очито је да ће формирање јасније археолошке слике уследити тек публикавањем ситних налаза и критичким укрштањем информација са подацима из теренских дневника и објављених радова.

*Received: 10 April 2007*

UDC 902.032:903.4-033.64](497.11 Vinča)