ARTEFACTS FROM THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY AND THEIR INTERPRETATIONS IN THE OFFICE: THE CASE OF A PREHISTORIC COPPER ORNAMENT FROM BOHOLT

Cristian Ioan POPA*

Abstract. The present discussion is focused on a copper ornament discovered in the Coţofeni settlement from Boholt. “Ciuta.” Until now, it has erroneously been considered to be a necklace, but a direct analysis of the artefact has shown that it is, in fact, a bracelet with rolled ends. The issue with the terminology used in the case of such items has been discussed at length, as were the reasons why the ornament from Boholt is not a necklace but a bracelet ring, as were the very rare analogies for this type of item from a previous period (Cucuteni culture, “the pill-shaped handle” horizon).
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A metal ornament was discovered approximately four decades ago, in a prehistoric settlement in Boholt (Şoimuş commune, Hunedoara County). According to the museum record, the artefact was subsequently the subject of a paper presented by Ioan Andriţoiu in Alba Iulia in 1981. However, neither the paper nor the artefact were ever published in detail; a few years later, the author of the discovery merely made a few remarks regarding the object.

Some references to the item were made later, but without actually showing it but simply relying on the functional classification made by Ioan Andriţoiu. The references were made in Horia Ciugudean’s syntheses from 2000 and 2002, two works with large circulation that are cited often. Although the piece has since been graphically illustrated, the discovery was the subject of new references, through different comparisons with other
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*“1 Decembrie 1918” University of Alba Iulia, Romania; e-mail: cristi72popa@yahoo.com.
1 Ioan Andriţoiu, Un colier de cupru descoperit în aşezarea de tip Coţofeni de la Boholt (jud. Hunedoara) [A copper necklace discovered in the Coţofeni settlement in Boholt (Hunedoara County)]; the paper was presented at the Session of Scientific Communications entitled “Continuitate, unitate şi independenţă în istoria poporului român” [Continuity, unity and independence in the history of the Romanian people], Alba Iulia, December 1981 (see also Basarab 1982-1983, p. 736).
2 Andriţoiu 1985, p. 12, note 26, in which the author, while listing the four metal items attributed to the Coţofeni culture from southwestern Transylvania, evasively mentions the “Boholt (necklace).”
3 The item is held by the collections of the Museum of Dacian and Roman Civilization in Deva, under the inventory number 28.089.
4 Ciugudean 2000, p. 37; Ciugudean 2002, p. 100.
5 Kadar 2007, p. 165 (no. 207), 242 (no. 65), pl. 41/14.

types. Therefore, I believe it is necessary to clarify certain essential aspects with respect to this particular item and to publish the information available to us at this time.

The context of the discovery

The provenance of the metal item from Boholt is unclear. The information provided by Ioan Andriţoiu in the above-cited publications is quite scarce and highly uncertain.

The first professional archaeological research on this site was undertaken in 1974, when the aforementioned archaeologist from Deva probed the crest of the Ciuta Hill in Boholt, at an altitude of 448 meters (RAN code 91367.01). A fireplace was thus partially uncovered and, although it was labelled as the “hearth of a dwelling,” there is no other clue regarding the dwelling itself, which leads me to believe that the statement regarding the complex was merely an assumption. Potsherds, flint pieces and three bone tools were discovered. We do not know whether the entire material presented by Andriţoiu (fig. 6) was recovered exclusively from this context or from the entire dig, since it also includes a 0.25 m thick cultural layer. It is certain that in 1979, when the results of the research were published, there was no information regarding the metal item. What we do know is that certain surface surveys had been carried out here, but making a connection between the artefact under scrutiny and these studies would be highly risky.

The sites at Boholt have been mentioned in the scholarly literature since the end of the nineteenth century. After a surface survey on Ciuta Hill, István Téglás noted the discovery of several potsherds with fingernail impressions, decorated through incisions or various applications, as well as several jasper, chalcedony and silex items, spread out over the crest. He also noted some similar materials from the neighbouring highlands of Măgulicea. This information has also circulated in various publications from
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7 Andriţoiu 1978, p. 66-67, no. 15.
8 See also http://ran.cimec.ro/sel.asp?codran=91367.01, accessed 21 December 2016. On this website, the name of the village is twice misspelled as “Boholț”, a village from the Braşov County.
9 Although the author includes Boholt on the list of Coţofeni settlements with surface dwellings (Andriţoiu 1992, p. 17).
10 Andriţoiu 1979, p. 19, pl. I/10-23; II/1-2.
12 Téglás 1891, p. 64. The materials are held by the Museum of Cluj (Téglás 1891, p. 64; Téglás 1902, p. 12; the information is cited from Luca 2008, p. 34, no. 50; Sava 2015, p. 20, 58, 238).
the first half of the twentieth century. A portion of the materials held by the Museum of Cluj were illustrated for the first time by Hans Reinerth in 1929, followed by Márton Roska in the early 1940s. However, neither could name their point of origin with certainty. Another lot from Boholt, which probably also originated from *Ciuta*, is held by the museum in Deva and remains still unique to this day (fig. 6-7). Since then, a considerably large number of scholarly texts have addressed this issue, but they merely summarise the information given by the aforementioned authors, with no new contributions.

**Description of the artefact**

In 2006, I was able to create a drawing of the item under scrutiny after it had been subjected to a metallographic analysis. I was thus able to collate the data with the existing information. The ornament is made of a single wire with a round cross-section and a thickened middle (3-4 mm). The ends were thinned (1-1.5 mm) and rolled inwards in the shape of a spiral (fig. 5a). The entire wire was then curved, thus forming an ornament that seems to be an open-end bracelet enclosing an oval space of approx. 5 x 4 cm (fig. 5b). The deformation of the item modified its original form and probably occurred during prehistoric times. As a result of this mechanical intervention, one of the ends was straightened. We cannot know whether the broken coil was caused entirely by the same intervention from that period, or if it is the result of a cut made during the recent metallographic analysis. Uncoiled, the metal wire is approximately 16 cm long, to which we must add the missing piece, which would give it a total length of 17 cm.

The item has a relatively well preserved light green slip that provides clues regarding the raw materials used in its making: copper or bronze. Spectrometric analyses with atomic emission undertaken in Bristol have
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13 Téglás 1902, p. 12; Wosinsky 1904, p. 27, no. 8; Schroller 1933, p. 76, no. 72.
14 Reinerth 1929, fig. 3/11, 17; 5/28-29.
15 Roska 1941, p. 52-53, no. 42, fig. 7-8; Roska 1942, p. 43, no. 150, fig. 39-40.
16 The following inventory numbers are assigned to: ceramics - 3610-3611; 3612-3625 (old numbers); 3844-3845; 3846-3859 (new numbers) and a stone axe - 4031.
18 In order to offer an image of the item, I have made a graphic representation (fig. 1/2).
19 As I have already mentioned, I drew the item after these destructive analyses.
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confirmed the visual assessments, indicating a copper item with a 93.83% concentration of copper (see the table below, after Manuella Kadar).²⁰

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item name</th>
<th>Assay-sample number</th>
<th>Sn</th>
<th>Pb</th>
<th>As</th>
<th>Sb</th>
<th>Ag</th>
<th>Ni</th>
<th>Au</th>
<th>Zn</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Hg</th>
<th>Cu%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necklace</td>
<td>B77</td>
<td>n.d</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>n.d</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>93.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.m. = not measured; n.d. = not detected.

**Functional ascription: Necklace or bracelet?**

Ioan Andriţoiu, who noted the copper ornament from Boholt, assigned it to the *necklace* category. Under this categorization he also mentions it in the footnotes of an article²¹ and in the title of the scientific communication in which he presented the item.²²

For decades, other authors have also mentioned it in their works without showing a single image or presenting its features in much detail. In his syntheses on the metallurgy of Coţofeni communities, Horia Ciugudean also included the item under the *necklace* category and opined that it had no homologue in Coţofeni areas, but suggested that it did have a precedent represented by an item found in the Eneolithic cemetery in Decea Mureşului, as well as some chronologically closer analogies in the hoard found at Velká Lomnica, in the Baden cultural area.²³ In a previous discussion on the Bronze Age bar bracelet prototype from Deva, Andriţoiu still referenced the item found in the necropolis in Decea Mureşului, which “represents the earliest known such item from the Danube-Carpathian region.”²⁴ Therefore, the item from Boholt could be understood as nothing more than a link between Eneolithic necklaces and Bronze Age necklaces from the Carpathian Basin region.

If we were to accept that the item from Boholt belongs to the necklace category, we would also have to consider that there are two sub-categories, dependent upon the method of manufacturing the wire: hammering or casting. The latter method is exclusively characteristic of the Bronze Age, the former defining a previous and, as such, archaic period of manufacturing technique. The following text discusses which sub-type our item belongs to.

²⁰ Kadar 2007, p. 165 (no. 207), 242 (no. 65).
The first of the aforementioned precedents from the Carpathian Basin is represented by the discovery from the necropolis in Decea Mureşului (today Decea village, Alba County), where the oldest known necklace (15 cm in diameter) in Transylvania was found around the neck of the M4 body (fig. 2). It is also the oldest known necklace with rolled ends in Europe. István Kovács initially described the item as having simple, sharp ends (fig. 1a),25 shortly after, this information was also used by Ion Nestor.26 Over a decade later, Kovács published a Hungarian version of his study on the cemetery in Decea, offering new information regarding the metal ornament, since, after studying the grave in the museum, a rolled end was also found which, according to the author, could have only belonged to the necklace (fig. 1b).27 However, there are still sceptics who doubt that the item from Decea Mureşului could have had rolled ends.28 One of the more vocal sceptics is Blagoje Govedarica.29 At that time, there were no other similar items. The only analogy from the necklace category was found on the left side of the Prut River, in a grave in Căinari (Republic of Moldova), but it has simple, straight ends.30 The aforementioned analogies that can be made with later Eneolithic discoveries,31 such as the ones from Książnice associated with the Lublin-Volhynian Culture,32 are relative, since either they only reference their function as necklaces - all of these items have straight ends - or they are considered to be diadems, as is the case with the item from Gorodnitsa (Cucuteni Culture, phase A-B).33 However we interpret things, it seems obvious that the earliest necklaces - both the item from Căinari (Republic of Moldova) and the one from Decea Mureşului - have

25 Kovács 1932, p. 92, fig. 4/2.
26 Nestor 1933, p. 73, pl. 10/1 and note 282, with the observation that “Ein Ösenhalstring (“ingot-torque”) fand sich entgegen der Behauptung Childes [...] in Decia nicht.”
27 Kovács 1944, p. 7, fig. 5/2. This item was also cited by other authors, such as István Bóna (Bóna 1975, p. 282, who includes the finding in “Frühen BZ 1”), Ann Dodd-Oprițescu (Dodd-Oprițescu 1978, p. 88: “torque [...] extrémités en volutes” and note 9); Mária Novotná (Novotná 1981, p. 121-122, fig. 1/1), Florin Gogăltan (Gogăltan 1999, p. 160) and Alexandra Găvan (Găvan 2013, p. 158). Dragoș Diaconescu considered it to be a “stranded necklace” (Diaconescu 2009, p. 81-82).
28 The version of the necklace with straight ends is present in Metalurgia 1995, p. 24 (“necklace”); Luca 1999, fig. 33/8 includes the necklace among local items (p. 34) with Steppe influences (p. 44); see also Mareș 2002, p. 130, 226, pl. 61/16.
30 Ibid., pl. 7/8; Dergačev 2002, pl. 10A/2; 92.
31 See the latest discussion on the matter in Frînculeasa et al. 2014, p. 201-202.
32 Wilk 2004, p. 227, fig. 47/3; 11/1.
eastern origins, and they are the only ones to have been dated to the fifth millennium BC with certainty.\textsuperscript{34}

Other earlier items include those from central-northern Anatolia, discovered in Resulğlu,\textsuperscript{35} Balıbag\textsuperscript{36} and Oylum Höyük,\textsuperscript{37} dated to the Anatolian Early Bronze Age, approximately from the mid-third millennium BC. Anca-Diana Popescu\textsuperscript{38} also mentioned them, confirming the chronology proposed by Mária Novotná in her assessment of the older age of the Central European items.\textsuperscript{39} The age of the European items is indirectly suggested through several discoveries that are connected to statuary. For instance, in the Gumelnita culture settlement (phase B\textsubscript{1}) in Căscioarele, a bone statue was found bearing a (miniature) necklace made from a copper plate around its neck.\textsuperscript{40} Furthermore, in the Cucuteni culture area of Ruginoasa, two male anthropomorphic statues were found, sculpted as if wearing ornaments around their necks that could also be considered necklaces.\textsuperscript{41}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{copper_necklace.png}
\caption{The copper necklace from grave 4 of the necropolis in Decea Mureșului (a - the version with straight ends; b - the version with rolled ends) (after Kovács 1932 - 1; Kovács 1944 - 2)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{34} M. Novotná considers the necklace from Decea Mureșului to be the oldest one known, while also drawing attention to the corpse that was wearing it. The skull indicated trepanation, which would suggest that that person held a distinctive position within the community, since, in the Baden culture, the wearers of necklaces received special treatments and inventories (Novotná 1981, p. 125-126; Novotná 1984, p. 7, 11); see also Frînculeasa et al. 2014, p. 202, fig. 7. In their study, the authors erroneously include an item “from the grave in Marosdéces that remained uncertain” - the confusion between Decea Mureșului and the Hungarian name of the village (Marosdécse) is obvious. In the article cited by the authors (Ecsedy 1971, p. 12, notes 6 and 20), I. Ecsedy makes no such claim.

\textsuperscript{35} Yıldırım 2006, p. 11, fig. 17/c-d.

\textsuperscript{36} The item has two, symmetrical, decorative bosses on its body (Süel 1989, p. 150, fig. 5/16 = 18).

\textsuperscript{37} Özgen 1989, p. 204-205, photo 9.

\textsuperscript{38} Popescu 2013, p. 167-168.

\textsuperscript{39} Novotná 1981, p. 122; Novotná 1984, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{40} Mareș 2002, p. 130, 207, pl. 61/17.

\textsuperscript{41} Lazarovici, Lazarovici 2009, p. 39-40, 43, fig. 3-4; see also the more reserved Țurcanu 2011, p. 26.
Fig. 2. Grave 4 of the necropolis from Decea Mureșului, showing the way in which the necklace was worn around the neck (after Kovács 1932)

Fig. 3. Grave 5 in Ariceștii Rahtivani, containing a copper necklace, (after Frînculeasa et al.)

Later, necklaces with rolled ends reappeared in Central Europe in Baden culture areas. They reappeared in the now familiar funerary contexts, as attested to in the discoveries from Leobersdorf,\textsuperscript{42} Lichtenwörth\textsuperscript{43} and Baden-\textit{Königshöhle}.\textsuperscript{44} More necklaces of this type were also found in the hoard discovered in Vel’ká Lomnica, having been preserved in a Late Baden vessel from the periphery of this ceramic style; however, their ends were not rolled, but bent.\textsuperscript{45} This relatively ignored detail is important. Recently, an item similar to those from Slovakia was discovered in in Ariceștii-Rahtivani, Romania, in a tumular grave associated with the Jamnaia culture. Its currently unique presence in this culture was emphasized, and it generated a

\textsuperscript{42} Kuna 1981, p. 53, pl. XXI/B 6; Novotná 1981, p. 122, fig. 1/3; Schasse 2010, p. 57, pl. 86/7.

\textsuperscript{43} Novotná 1981, p. 122, fig. 1/4; Schasse 2010, p. 58, pl. 87/2-4.

\textsuperscript{44} Novotná 1981, p. 122, fig. 1/6.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., p. 122; Novotná 1984, p. 2, 9-10, 72, pl. 1/1-4 = 72/1-4.
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discussion on Eneolithic and Bronze Age necklaces.\textsuperscript{46} However, we must make an amendment regarding its classification: it does not have rolled ends, as the authors describe, but bent ends, just like the items from Vel’ká Lomnica. The uniqueness of the necklace from Ariceștii-Rahtivani (\textbf{fig. 3}) among the Jamnaia discoveries, found in the vicinity of the Coțofeni culture, raises interesting questions regarding the exchanges that were taking place between the populations in the Lower Danube area, as well as issues regarding its cultural classification. Even though proposing a certain cultural affiliation of the M 3B grave is quite difficult, it has been convincingly shown that the vessel from its inventory undoubtedly belongs to the Coțofeni culture.\textsuperscript{47} The otherwise banal baked-clay pendant found around the neck of M 5A also seems to indicate Coțofeni culture, but, in the Coțofeni area, its shape is most often transposed in stone,\textsuperscript{48} rarely in metal.\textsuperscript{49} Another observation can be made regarding the M 5B inventory (which also includes the copper necklace) - although many analogies have been made with finds from the Baden and Coțofeni cultures,\textsuperscript{50} the cup has much better correspondences in shape and style with the cups with different funerary purposes found in Early Bronze Age tumular graves in Transylvania. However, the early dating of the grave in Ariceștii-Rahtivani is surprising, since the C\textsubscript{14} assay indicates the final quarter of the fourth millennium BC.\textsuperscript{51}

Similar larger items with ends rolled outwards that seem to be made to be worn around the neck appear until the Late Bronze Age,\textsuperscript{52} but most of them are from Central Europe, from the Reinecke Bz A1-A2 period, and many specialists consider them to be pre-monetary tokens.\textsuperscript{53} We cannot know whether it is relevant to seek connections between the necklaces found in Central Europe and the very old discoveries\textsuperscript{54} from the east of the

\textsuperscript{46} Frînculeasa et al. 2014, p. 192, 201-202, tab. 2, fig. 7/9, pl. 8/2, 5; 9/2; 10/5-9; Frînculeasa et al. 2015, p. 59, 61, 72, pl. 8/3; 9/2, 8; see also Preda 2015, p. 13-14, fig. 2/1.
\textsuperscript{47} Frînculeasa et al. 2014, p. 190, 197, pl. 5. The analogies were well identified, the most relevant of which being with one of the vessels from the Coțofeni complex 5 in Silvașu de Sus (Luca et al. 2011, p. 19, pl. 5/2).
\textsuperscript{48} Popa 2013, p. 31-36, fig. 1-2.
\textsuperscript{49} Popa 2011, p. 39-41, fig. 1/2; 2.
\textsuperscript{50} Frînculeasa et al. 2014, p. 197, pl. 8/2, 4; 9/1; 10/1-2.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., p. 205, tab. 2.
\textsuperscript{52} As are, for instance, the items from the hoard from Aiud (Petrescu-Dimbovița 1998, pl. 23; 24/184, 187-188).
\textsuperscript{53} Lenerz-de Wilde 1995; Junk et al. 2001, p. 356; Vandkilde 2005, p. 264, fig. 2; Jablonka 2014, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{54} Novotná 1981, p. 121.
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Mediterranean Basin (such as the discoveries from the hoard from Byblos).^55^ There have been very few necklaces of this type dated to the Bronze Age found in Romanian territory. The western extremity offered two items from the Mureş culture area, specifically Beba Veche^56^ (BT IIb) and the Corneşti-Crvenka area, in the tell from Periam^57^ (BM I) and Maglavit.^58^ In Transylvania, necklaces have been found at the feet of certain mountains or in passes in three locations: Deva,^59^ Cetea^60^, or in north Muntenia, at Predeal;^61^ these items are known with certainty to have belonged to the Wietenberg culture. Examples from the Monteuro culture were found among funerary discoveries in Sărata Monteuro, Pietroasa Mică, Cândeşti and Cărômăneşti.^62^

According to the definition of a necklace, regardless of its origins, it is an item “made to be worn around the neck,” but it could also be “a metal object in the shape of a ring or a bracelet, used to bind other items together.”^63^ The etymology of the Romanian term “colier”, from the lat. *collum* = “neck,”^64^ should limit the functionality of the artefacts that the archaeologists call “necklaces” to their wearing only around the neck (Germ. Halsringe; Eng. neck ring), some of which have rolled ends, in the shape of loops (Germ. Ösenhalsringe). Florin Gogăltan^65^ and Alexandra Găvan^66^ call them “ear necklaces.”
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55 Hubert 1925, p. 15, pl. II; Gerloff 1993, p. 66-67, 86, fig. 4/1. See the similar Bronze Age discoveries from Egypt (Bittel 1933, p. 92-94, fig. 1-2).
56 Gogăltan 1999, p. 91, 160-161, fig. 26/2.
57 Roska 1942, p. 224, fig. 272/2; Gogăltan 1999, p. 102, 161, 208, fig. 26/1.
59 The ten necklaces that compile the hoard (Deva I) discovered in Deva, in *Dealul Cetăţii*, are representative examples for the southwestern Transylvanian space, which also includes the item from Boholt (see Nestor 1944-1945, p. 165-181, fig. 1-3; Petrescu-Dimbovița 1977, p. 40, pl. 2/4-9; Andrițoiu 1992, p. 74, 78, 86, 91, pl. 67/1-10; Andrițoiu 1993, p. 90, 97, 100, 106, pl. III/1-10; Ciugudean 1996, p. 125-126, fig. 89; Popa 2005, p. 148-149, pl. 39-40/3-6; Soroceanu 2012, p. 32-34, pl. 11/3-6; 12/1-6).
60 From the older discoveries from Cetea, Nikolaus Boroffka published a necklace fragment with rolled ends (Boroffka 1994, p. 29, 232, 237, pl. 146/2); see also Țărlea et al. 2009, p. 324-325, pl. 7/10.
62 A similar lost necklace was also discovered in the inventory of another grave; see Motzoi-Chicideanu, Gugiu 2004, p. 8, 17-20 (and the discussion), fig. 3/1 = 4/2; Motzoi-Chicideanu et al. 2007, p. 4, 12, fig. 4/1, 3.1.
64 In Romanian, “gât”, Scriban 1939, p. 317, s.v. *colier*.
66 Găvan 2013, p. 158.
Therefore, due to the small diameter of its interior (approx. 5 cm), the item from Boholt cannot be considered an authentic necklace. Furthermore, there has been a complete lack of similar artefacts found in the Coțofeni culture area; nor have any similar contemporary items this small from which cultural exchanges could be inferred been found in neighbouring localities.

It would appear that we must seek the origin of this type of ornament in the Cucuteni-Tripolje culture area. Two items from the hoard of metal objects found in Gorodnitsa (dated to the Cucuteni A-B phase, possibly even the incipient Cucuteni B phase) were missing from the initial publication, but were subsequently mentioned by Mária Novotná. Although only one item was depicted,⁶⁷ (fig. 5/2) its similarity with the ornament from Boholt is visible. Their likeness regards both their crafting, from wire, and the rolling technique applied to the ends. They are also similar in diameter: 5.5 x 5.2 cm and 5.4 cm in the case of the items from Gorodnitsa⁶⁸ and 5 x 4 cm in the case of the item from Boholt.

Mária Novotná used the term “Ösenhalsringen”⁶⁹ for the two ornaments from Gorodnitsa, although, because of their small dimensions, they could not have been worn around the neck, not even by an infans I child. Therefore, I do not believe that they represent miniature replicas of necklaces, but a different type of ornament. Their sizes and shapes indicate that they are more likely bracelets worn around the wrists. The rolled ends could have both decorative and practical purposes, since the design would prevent damage to the skin or to clothing, especially important if the item also had a functional purpose, such as tightening the sleeves of a shirt.

There is another example of a copper bracelet which has also been investigated very little, first mentioned in old research conducted at Pecica-Șanțul Mare. M. Roska illustrated it schematically, together with other metal objects, mentioning that it originated from the oldest deposition of the settlement;⁷⁰ it was republished two decades ago in a drawing that indicates a bracelet (Armringe) with an oval section, a straight end and a rolled end (fig. 5/3).⁷¹ Judging by the Eneolithic materials discovered here in the first

---

⁶⁸ Novotná 1984, p. 2.
⁷⁰ Roska 1942, p. 224, fig. 275/1. Another copper bracelet with straight ends is illustrated from the same source (Roska 1942, fig. 275/4; Petrescu-Dîmboviţa 1998, p. 114, pl. 98/1270).
⁷¹ Petrescu-Dîmboviţa 1998, p. 105, pl. 91/1159. The item, together with another bracelet published by Roska, is mentioned among the Eneolithic discoveries by V. Sava, but only in the older publication, offering no details regarding the rolled end (Sava 2015, p. 282, “two bracelets with open ends, made of at strap [made of wire, a.n.], rectangular in transversal section”). Furthermore, P. Roman published the second bracelet (“Kupferarmringe”) from the layer attributed to the Eneolithic horizon (Roman 1971, p. 85, fig. 34/3).
layer, we can determine that the ornament belongs to the “the pill-shaped handle” horizon. Therefore, it is chronologically closer to the item found in Gorodnitsa, but it is distinguished by its unique shape, having just one rolled end. What makes it more similar to the two aforementioned items is its small size, which once again supports the hypothesis that such items were used as bracelets. Their small interior diameter suggests that they were most likely worn by young girls. The possibility that they may have been used as secondary accessories, over another type of ornament, cannot be completely excluded, but there are no arguments in this respect.

The number of metal bracelets found in the Coţofeni culture area is rather small. Limiting the discussion to the confirmed stratigraphic contexts, we can only refer to two certain items, both of which are single-spiral items: one originating from the Coţofeni III dwelling in Sebeş-Papuc,72 and the other from Poiana Ampoiului-Piatra Corbului.73 In terms of its dimensions, the bracelet from Sebeş is the most similar to the one from Boholt (fig. 4/1). Although it is deformed, we can imagine its similar shape. The Sebeş item, however, is different in terms of its rolled ends and rectangular cross-section. It also has a twist in its middle, but this may have occurred accidentally (perhaps in the same accident that destroyed its initial shape); I do not believe it represents a form of decoration. With respect to the manufacturing methods, the closest temporal and geographic analogies for the bracelet from Sebeş are the items found in tumular graves dated to the beginning of the Bronze Age in Mada74 and Poiana Aiudului.75

The bracelet fragment from Poiana Ampoiului has a circular cross-section, just like the item from Boholt. However, it is difficult to classify due to its small dimensions (fig. 4/2). A copper item from a Coţofeni III dwelling (L 8) from the Şincai-Cetatea Păgânilor site also seems to be deformed; its ends are very bent, but it is difficult to establish whether it is raw material or a finished item76 (fig. 4/4). Another copper wire from

72 Ciugudean 2000, p. 37, pl. 134/4; Ciugudean 2002, p. 100, pl. 2/4.
73 Ciugudean 2000, p. 37, pl. 134/5; Ciugudean 2002, p. 100, pl. 2/5. Note the stratigraphic position of the bracelet from Poiana Ampoiului, from a late Coţofeni III level, in which item from the Early Bronze Age also appeared (Ciugudean 1996, p. 63).
74 The items were originally illustrated by M. Kadar, but they were erroneously attributed to the Coţofeni culture (Kadar 2007, p. 164, pl. 41/11-12). The complete publication of the discovery can be found in Rişcuţa et al. 2009, p. 267, fig. 10/2-3.
75 The section of these bracelets is in the shape of the letter “D”; see Vlassa et al. 1985-1986, p. 62, pl. XI/1; Petrescu-Dîmboviţa 1998, p. 39, 41, pl. 25/201, in which the discoveries are attributed to the Coţofeni culture.
76 Lazăr 1995, p. 253, pl. LXII/29; Lazăr 1998, p. 43, note 1, fig. 1/1 („the spiral”). M. Kadar considers the bracelet to be a secondary item (small wire) (Kadar 2007, p. 165, pl. 43/4). H. Ciugudean only illustrates the artifact, without discussing it (Ciugudean 2000, pl. 134/20; Ciugudean 2002, pl. 2/20).
dwellings 5 on the same site, could also be the residue of a bracelet (fig. 4/3).

**Fig. 4.** Bracelets (1-2) or raw materials for a bracelet (3-4) from the Coțofeni culture: Sebeș-Papuc (1), Poiana Ampoiului-Piatra Corbului (2), Șîncăi-Cetatea Pâgânilor (3-4) (after H. Ciugudean - 2, V. Lazăr - 4; 1, 3 - drawings C. I. Popa)

Two bracelets with rolled ends from the cemetery in Cruceni, as well as a small spiral arm-guard (Handschutzspiralen) from the hoard found in Aiud, similar to the item from Boholt, indicate a function connected to their being worn on the arm, and attest to the perpetuation of such artefacts until the Late Bronze Age (Bz D-Ha A).

**Conclusions**
Several conclusions can be drawn from this direct, typological and functional analysis of the metal object from Boholt.

The first important observation is that the item, due to its small dimensions, was not a necklace, but a bracelet. The substantial chronological gap between the Cucuteni A-B phase and the “the pill-shaped handle” horizon, where the only other analogies can be found, and the Coțofeni III phase, compel us to limit the discussion to finding the origins of this type of ornament. At the moment, there are no links between the two eras, which lie approximately 1,000 years apart, or between the necklaces with rolled ends. This absence of analogies is a result of what archaeologists call “the metallurgic decline”, which took place after the disappearance of the “the pill-shaped handle” horizon. However, just as in the case of the necklaces with rolled ends, we must also take into account the local, central-eastern European models, which, in time, proved to be older than the alleged “early” analogies from Anatolia and other eastern locales. Thus, there are two types of similar ornament, with identical closing systems and rolled ends, but with different usages: neck-rings (Ösenhalsringen) and bracelets (Armringen).

---

79 Ibid., p. 33, pl. 23/183.
An analysis of the context in which European Eneolithic bracelets have been found shows that over 75% were discovered in graves.\(^{80}\) As such, it is important note that the items from Coţofeni areas were found in settlements. The situation was “normalized” during the Early Bronze Age, when burials in Transylvania began to occur in greater numbers and the inventories always contained bracelets. The typological analysis threw up certain differences, but similarities as well. The chemical composition yielded similar results to other analogies: 93.83% Cu in the bracelet from Boholt; 92.14% and 94.06% Cu in the bracelets from the tumular grave at Mada.\(^{81}\) Although there are strong arguments in favour of assigning the metal object from Boholt to the Coţofeni culture (phase III) given by its discoverer, we must also consider the fact that there were other discoveries made here. On Ciuta Hill, the discoveries were attributed to the Şoimuş cultural group, but we do not know whether they originate from the survey made in 1947 (in which such materials were not illustrated), or from the surveys mentioned later by I. Andriţoiu.\(^{82}\) A Şoimuş-type potsherd from Boholt was also published by M. Roska, from I. Téglás’s surface surveys; contrary to popular opinions, this practically represents the oldest illustration of this type of discovery from that cultural group.\(^{83}\) The Early Bronze Age dwelling would have been smaller than the Coţofeni one, the latter being partially overlapped by the first.\(^{84}\) However, given the shortage of metal objects from the Şoimuş group dwellings,\(^{85}\) I believe that assigning the ornament to an Early Bronze Age horizon is implausible.

The ornament from Boholt must be reassessed in a future serious debate regarding the types of metal artefacts found in the Coţofeni culture area. Such an endeavour is necessary both in clarifying certain evolutionary-typological systems in which the item under scrutiny would have - erroneously - been an important link, and in the study of one of the very few copper objects known from Coţofeni settlements.

(Translated by Anca Chiorean)

\(^{80}\) Manzura 2003, p. 390.
\(^{81}\) Kadar 2007, p. 242, no. 63-64.
\(^{82}\) Andriţoiu 1989, p. 39-40; for the Şoimuş discoveries from Boholt, see also Andriţoiu 1992, p. 14, 19-20, 120, no. 14; Rişcuţa 2002, p. 25; Rişcuţa, Andriţoiu 2007, p. 29-30, 37, no. 15.
\(^{83}\) Roska 1941, fig. 7/19. Although the oldest materials identified today as Şoimuş items belong to the old collections held by the museum from Deva, starting with the 19th century (Rişcuţa 1997-1998, p. 103-104; Rişcuţa, Andriţoiu 2007, p. 29) scholars believed that the first illustration of materials belonging to this cultural group were made by N. Harţuche by publishing the ones from Țebea (Andriţoiu 1989, p. 39; Andriţoiu 1992, p. 13-14).
\(^{84}\) Andriţoiu 1992, p. 120, no. 14; Rişcuţa, Andriţoiu 2007, p. 37.
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**Fig. 5.** The copper bracelet from Boholt (1a), with the attempt to reconstruct its initial shape (1b); bracelets from Gorodnitsa (2) and Pecica-Şanţul Mare (1a-1b - drawings C. I. Popa; 2 - after Mária Novotná 1981; 3 - after Petrescu-Dimboviţa 1998)
Fig. 6. Archaeological materials discovered in Boholt-Ćinta during the survey carried out by Ioan Andriţoiu (after Andriţoiu 1979)
Fig. 7. Coțofeni III potsherds from older investigations carried out in Boholt-Cinta (after Roska 1941)
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